



CONFERENCE OF BISHOPS
OF THE
ANGLICAN COMMUNION.

*HOLDEN AT LAMBETH PALACE,
IN JULY 1888.*

Encyclical Letter
FROM THE BISHOPS,
WITH THE
RESOLUTIONS AND REPORTS.

LONDON :
SOCIETY FOR PROMOTING CHRISTIAN KNOWLEDGE,
NORTHUMBERLAND AVENUE, CHARING CROSS, W.C. ;
43, QUEEN VICTORIA STREET.
BRIGHTON : 135, NORTH STREET.

1888.

LONDON :
PRINTED BY PHIPPS AND CONNOR, TOTHILL STREET,
WESTMINSTER.

CONTENTS.



I.—List of the Bishops attending the Conference ; arranged according to date of Consecration	...	page	2
II.—List of the Bishops attending the Conference ; arranged according to Provinces...	...	page	4
III.—Encyclical Letter from the Assembled Bishops		page	7
IV.—Resolutions formally adopted by the Conference		page	21
V.—Reports of Committees :—			
(1) Intemperance	...	page	31
(2) Purity	...	page	39
(3) Divorce	...	page	43
(4) Polygamy	...	page	45
(5) Observance of Sunday	...	page	48
(6) Socialism	...	page	50
(7) Care of Emigrants	...	page	58
(8) Mutual Relations of Dioceses and Branches of the Anglican Communion	...	page	69
(9) Home Reunion	...	page	81
(10) Scandinavian Church, Old Catholics, &c.		page	90
(11) Eastern Churches...	...	page	99
(12) Authoritative Standards of Doctrine and Worship	...	page	105



LIST OF THE BISHOPS ATTENDING THE LAMBETH
CONFERENCE OF 1888.

[With the exception of Metropolitans and others entitled to special precedence, the Bishops are arranged, in the following list, according to the date of their consecration.]

- ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY, 25th April, 1877.
ARCHBISHOP OF YORK, 15th December, 1861.
ARCHBISHOP OF ARMAGH, 1st May, 1849.
ARCHBISHOP OF DUBLIN, 10th December, 1876.
- BISHOP OF GUIANA, 24th August, 1842.
BISHOP OF FREDERICTON, 4th May, 1845.
BISHOP OF RUPERTSLAND, 24th June, 1865.
BISHOP OF BRECHIN, 28th October, 1871.
BISHOP OF CAPETOWN, 17th May, 1874.
BISHOP OF CALCUTTA, 30th November, 1876.
BISHOP OF SYDNEY, 1st January, 1884.
- BISHOP OF LONDON, 21st December, 1869.
BISHOP OF DURHAM, 25th April, 1879.
BISHOP OF WINCHESTER, 29th March, 1864.
BISHOP PERRY, 29th June, 1847.
BISHOP OF ST. ANDREW'S, 25th January, 1853.
BISHOP OF NORWICH, 11th June, 1857.
BISHOP OF COLUMBIA, 24th February, 1859.
BISHOP OF BANGOR, 14th June, 1859.
BISHOP TUFNELL, 14th June, 1859.
BISHOP OF MINNESOTA, 13th October, 1859.
BISHOP OF ANTIGUA, 17th May, 1860.
BISHOP OF ONTARIO, 25th March, 1862.
BISHOP OF GLOUCESTER AND BRISTOL, 25th March, 1863.
BISHOP OF QUEBEC, 21st June, 1863.
BISHOP IN THE NIGER TERRITORY, 29th June, 1864.
BISHOP BROMBY, 29th June, 1864.
BISHOP OF WESTERN NEW YORK, 4th January, 1865.
BISHOP OF TENNESSEE, 11th October, 1865.
BISHOP OF LIMERICK, 29th June, 1866.
BISHOP OF NELSON, 24th August, 1866.
BISHOP OF MAINE, 25th January, 1867.
BISHOP OF MISSOURI, 1st May, 1867.
BISHOP OF ST. ALBAN'S, 11th June, 1867.
BISHOP OF MORAY AND ROSS, 25th August, 1867.
BISHOP OF DERRY, 13th October, 1867.
BISHOP OF HEREFORD, 24th June, 1868.
BISHOP OF PETERBOROUGH, 15th November, 1868.
BISHOP OF OREGON, 3rd December, 1868.
BISHOP OF MARITZBURG, 25th January, 1869.
BISHOP OF ALBANY, 2nd February, 1869.
BISHOP OF AUCKLAND, 29th June, 1869.

- BISHOP OF PENNSYLVANIA, 13th October, 1869.
 BISHOP OF CARLISLE, 30th November, 1869.
 BISHOP OF BATH AND WELLS, 21st December, 1869.
 BISHOP OF FALKLAND ISLANDS, 21st December, 1869.
 BISHOP OF ARKANSAS, 25th January, 1870.
 BISHOP OF DOVER, 25th March, 1870.
 BISHOP OF CHICHESTER, 8th May, 1870.
 BISHOP OF ST. ASAPH, 8th May, 1870.
 BISHOP WILKINSON, 8th May, 1870.
 BISHOP OF GRAHAMSTOWN, 30th November, 1870.
 BISHOP OF DUNEDIN, 4th June, 1871.
 BISHOP OF HONOLULU, 2nd February, 1872.
 BISHOP OF CASHEL, 13th April, 1872.
 BISHOP OF TRINIDAD, 29th June, 1872.
 BISHOP OF MOOSONEE, 15th December, 1872.
 BISHOP OF SOUTH DAKOTA, 9th January, 1873.
 BISHOP MITCHINSON, 24th June, 1873.
 BISHOP OF MASSACHUSETTS, 17th September, 1873.
 BISHOP OF NORTH CAROLINA, 11th December, 1873.
 BISHOP OF COLORADO, 31st December, 1873.
 BISHOP OF GIBRALTAR, 1st February, 1874.
 BISHOP OF ST. DAVID'S, 24th August, 1874.
 BISHOP OF MILWAUKEE, 25th October, 1874.
 BISHOP OF NEW JERSEY, 2nd February, 1875.
 BISHOP OF CORK, 30th March, 1875.
 BISHOP OF CHICAGO, 8th December, 1875.
 BISHOP OF COLOMBO, 28th December, 1875.
 BISHOP OF BOMBAY, 1st May, 1876.
 BISHOP OF IOWA, 10th September, 1876.
 BISHOP OF MANCHESTER, 22nd October, 1876.
 BISHOP OF ROCHESTER, 25th June, 1877.
 BISHOP OF NOTTINGHAM, 21st December, 1877.
 BISHOP OF WAIAPU, 1st January, 1878.
 BISHOP OF PRETORIA, 2nd February, 1878.
 BISHOP OF NEWFOUNDLAND, 1st May, 1878.
 BISHOP OF QUINCY, 15th May, 1878.
 BISHOP OF SPRINGFIELD, 11th June, 1878.
 BISHOP OF LICHFIELD, 24th June, 1878.
 BISHOP CRAMER-ROBERTS, 24th June, 1878.
 BISHOP OF NORTH QUEENSLAND, 24th June, 1878.
 BISHOP OF OSSORY, September, 1878.
 BISHOP OF TORONTO, 1st May, 1879.
 BISHOP OF WAKEFIELD, 25th July, 1879.
 BISHOP OF TRAVANCORE AND COCHIN, 25th July, 1879.
 BISHOP OF CALEDONIA, 25th July, 1879.
 BISHOP OF MICHIGAN, 17th September, 1879.
 BISHOP OF NEW WESTMINSTER, 1st November, 1879.
 BISHOP OF NEWARK, 8th January, 1880.
 BISHOP OF LIVERPOOL, 11th June, 1880.
 BISHOP OF JAMAICA, 28th October, 1880.
 BISHOP IN NORTH CHINA, 28th October, 1880.
 BISHOP IN ZULULAND, 30th November, 1880.
 BISHOP OF WASHINGTON TERRITORY, 15th December, 1880.
 BISHOP OF SINGAPORE AND SARAWAK, 26th May, 1881.
 BISHOP COADJUTOR OF FREDERICTON, 10th July, 1881.
 BISHOP OF PITTSBURGH, 25th January, 1882.
 BISHOP OF RANGOON, 1st May, 1882.
 BISHOP OF BARBADOS, 1st May, 1882.

- BISHOP OF COLCHESTER, 24th June, 1882.
 BISHOP OF ALGOMA, 29th June, 1882.
 BISHOP OF NEWCASTLE, 25th July, 1882.
 BISHOP COADJUTOR OF ANTIGUA, 27th July, 1882.
 BISHOP OF ADELAIDE, 30th November, 1882.
 BISHOP OF MISSISSIPPI, 24th February, 1883.
 BISHOP OF SIERRA LEONE, 24th February, 1883.
 BISHOP OF LLANDAFF, 25th April, 1883.
 BISHOP OF TRURO, 25th April, 1883.
 BISHOP OF ABERDEEN, 1st May, 1883.
 BISHOP OF ST. JOHN'S, KAFFRARIA, 12th August, 1883.
 BISHOP OF ARGYLL AND THE ISLES, 24th August, 1883.
 BISHOP OF INDIANA, 14th October, 1883.
 BISHOP OF NEW YORK, 20th October, 1883.
 BISHOP IN CENTRAL AFRICA, 30th November, 1883.
 BISHOP OF HURON, 30th November, 1883.
 BISHOP OF NORTH DAKOTA, 20th December, 1883.
 BISHOP OF KILLALOE, 24th February, 1884.
 BISHOP OF KILMORE, 25th April, 1884.
 BISHOP OF CHESTER, 25th April, 1884.
 BISHOP OF SOUTHWELL, 1st May, 1884.
 BISHOP OF QU'APPELLE, 24th June, 1884.
 BISHOP OF RIPON, 25th July, 1884.
 ASST.-BISHOP OF CENTRAL PENNSYLVANIA, 28th October, 1884.
 BISHOP OF MARYLAND, 8th January, 1885.
 BISHOP OF LINCOLN, 25th April, 1885.
 BISHOP OF EXETER, 25th April, 1885.
 BISHOP OF NIAGARA, 1st May, 1885.
 BISHOP OF BRISBANE, 11th June, 1885.
 BISHOP OF MEATH, 29th September, 1885.
 BISHOP OF SALISBURY, 27th October, 1885.
 BISHOP OF ELY, 2nd February, 1886.
 BISHOP IN JAPAN, 2nd February, 1886.
 BISHOP OF NASSAU, 24th February, 1886.
 BISHOP OF CLOGHER, 29th June, 1886.
 BISHOP OF EDINBURGH, 21st September, 1886.
 BISHOP IN JERUSALEM AND THE EAST, 25th March, 1887.
 BISHOP OF SASKATCHEWAN & CALGARY, 7th August, 1887.
 BISHOP OF SODOR AND MAN, 24th August, 1887.
 BISHOP OF MARLBOROUGH, 24th February, 1888.
 BISHOP OF SHREWSBURY, 24th February, 1888.
 BISHOP OF NOVA SCOTIA, 25th April, 1888.
 BISHOP OF PENRITH, 22nd May, 1888.
 BISHOP OF BEDFORD, 15th July, 1888.
 BISHOP OF LEICESTER, 15th July, 1888.

LIST OF THE BISHOPS ATTENDING THE LAMBETH
CONFERENCE OF 1888, ARRANGED ACCORDING TO
PROVINCES.

ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY (MOST REV. DR. BENSON).
 BISHOP OF LONDON (RT. REV. DR. TEMPLE).
 BISHOP OF WINCHESTER (RT. REV. DR. HAROLD BROWNE).
 BISHOP OF NORWICH (RT. REV. AND HON. DR. PELHAM).
 BISHOP OF BANGOR (RT. REV. DR. CAMPBELL).
 BISHOP OF GLOUCESTER AND BRISTOL (RT. REV. DR. ELLICOTT).
 BISHOP OF ST. ALBAN'S (RT. REV. DR. CLAUGHTON).
 BISHOP OF HEREFORD (RT. REV. DR. ATLAY).
 BISHOP OF PETERBOROUGH (RT. REV. DR. MAGEE).
 BISHOP OF BATH AND WELLS (RT. REV. LORD A. HERVEY).
 BISHOP OF CHICHESTER (RT. REV. DR. DURNFORD).
 BISHOP OF ST. ASAPH (RT. REV. DR. HUGHES).
 BISHOP OF ST. DAVID'S (RT. REV. DR. BASIL JONES).
 BISHOP OF ROCHESTER (RT. REV. DR. THOROLD).
 BISHOP OF LICHFIELD (RT. REV. DR. MACLAGAN).
 BISHOP OF LLANDAFF (RT. REV. DR. LEWIS).
 BISHOP OF TRURO (RT. REV. DR. WILKINSON).
 BISHOP OF SOUTHWELL (RT. REV. DR. RIDDING).
 BISHOP OF LINCOLN (RT. REV. DR. KING).
 BISHOP OF EXETER (RT. REV. DR. E. H. BICKERSTETH).
 BISHOP OF SALISBURY (RT. REV. DR. J. WORDSWORTH).
 BISHOP OF ELY (RT. REV. LORD A. COMPTON).
 BISHOP SUFFRAGAN OF DOVER (RT. REV. DR. PARRY).
 BISHOP SUFFRAGAN OF NOTTINGHAM (RT. REV. DR. TROLLOPE).
 BISHOP SUFFRAGAN OF COLCHESTER (RT. REV. DR. BLOMFIELD).
 BISHOP SUFFRAGAN OF MARLBOROUGH (RT. REV. DR. EARLE).
 BISHOP SUFFRAGAN OF SHREWSBURY (RT. REV. SIR L. STAMER).
 BISHOP SUFFRAGAN OF BEDFORD (RT. REV. DR. BILLING).
 BISHOP SUFFRAGAN OF LEICESTER (RT. REV. DR. THICKNESSE).
 BISHOP PERRY.
 BISHOP TUFNELL.
 BISHOP BROMBY.
 BISHOP WILKINSON.
 BISHOP MITCHINSON.

ARCHBISHOP OF YORK (MOST REV. DR. THOMSON).
 BISHOP OF DURHAM (RT. REV. DR. LIGHTFOOT).
 BISHOP OF CARLISLE (RT. REV. DR. GOODWIN).
 BISHOP OF MANCHESTER (RT. REV. DR. MOORHOUSE).
 BISHOP OF WAKEFIELD (RT. REV. DR. WALSHAM HOW).
 BISHOP OF LIVERPOOL (RT. REV. DR. RYLE).
 BISHOP OF NEWCASTLE (RT. REV. DR. WILBERFORCE).
 BISHOP OF CHESTER (RT. REV. DR. STUBBS).
 BISHOP OF RIPON (RT. REV. DR. BOYD CARPENTER).
 BISHOP OF SODOR AND MAN (RT. REV. DR. BARDSLEY).
 BISHOP SUFFRAGAN OF PENRITH (RT. REV. DR. PULLEINE).
 BISHOP CRAMER-ROBERTS.

ARCHBISHOP OF ARMAGH (MOST REV. DR. KNOX).
 BISHOP OF MEATH (MOST REV. DR. REICHEL).

BISHOP OF DERRY (RT. REV. DR. ALEXANDER).
 BISHOP OF KILMORE (RT. REV. DR. SHONE).
 BISHOP OF CLOGHER (RT. REV. DR. STACK).

ARCHBISHOP OF DUBLIN (MOST REV. LORD PLUNKET).
 BISHOP OF LIMERICK (RT. REV. DR. GRAVES).
 BISHOP OF CASHEL (RT. REV. DR. DAY).
 BISHOP OF CORK (RT. REV. DR. GREGG).
 BISHOP OF OSSORY (RT. REV. DR. WALSH).
 BISHOP OF KILLALOE (RT. REV. DR. CHESTER).

BISHOP OF BRECHIN (RT. REV. DR. JERMYN), *Primus*.
 BISHOP OF ST. ANDREW'S (RT. REV. DR. C. WORDSWORTH).
 BISHOP OF MORAY AND ROSS (RT. REV. DR. KELLY).
 BISHOP OF ABERDEEN (RT. REV. AND HON. DR. DOUGLAS).
 BISHOP OF ARGYLL AND THE ISLES (RT. REV. DR. HALDANE).
 BISHOP OF EDINBURGH (RT. REV. DR. DOWDEN).

BISHOP OF MINNESOTA (RT. REV. DR. WHIPPLE).
 BISHOP OF WESTERN NEW YORK (RT. REV. DR. COXE).
 BISHOP OF TENNESSEE (RT. REV. DR. QUINTARD).
 BISHOP OF MAINE (RT. REV. DR. NEELY).
 BISHOP OF MISSOURI (RT. REV. DR. TUTTLE).
 BISHOP OF OREGON (RT. REV. DR. MORRIS).
 BISHOP OF ALBANY (RT. REV. DR. DOANE).
 BISHOP OF PENNSYLVANIA (RT. REV. DR. WHITAKER).
 BISHOP OF ARKANSAS (RT. REV. DR. PIERCE).
 BISHOP OF SOUTH DAKOTA (RT. REV. DR. HARE).
 BISHOP OF MASSACHUSETTS (RT. REV. DR. PADDOCK).
 BISHOP OF NORTH CAROLINA (RT. REV. DR. LYMAN).
 BISHOP OF COLORADO (RT. REV. DR. SPALDING).
 BISHOP OF MILWAUKEE (RT. REV. DR. WELLES).
 BISHOP OF NEW JERSEY (RT. REV. DR. SCARBOROUGH).
 BISHOP OF CHICAGO (RT. REV. DR. McLAREN).
 BISHOP OF IOWA (RT. REV. DR. STEVENS-PARRY).
 BISHOP OF QUINCY (RT. REV. DR. BURGESS).
 BISHOP OF SPRINGFIELD (RT. REV. DR. SEYMOUR).
 BISHOP OF MICHIGAN (RT. REV. DR. HARRIS).
 BISHOP OF NEWARK (RT. REV. DR. STARKEY).
 BISHOP OF WASHINGTON TERRITORY (RT. REV. DR. PADDOCK).
 BISHOP OF PITTSBURGH (RT. REV. DR. WHITEHEAD).
 BISHOP OF MISSISSIPPI (RT. REV. DR. THOMPSON).
 BISHOP OF INDIANA (RT. REV. DR. KINCKERBACKER).
 BISHOP OF NEW YORK (RT. REV. DR. POTTER).
 BISHOP OF NORTH DAKOTA (RT. REV. DR. WALKER).
 ASST.-BISHOP OF CENTRAL PENNSYLVANIA (RT. REV. DR. RULISON).
 BISHOP OF MARYLAND (RT. REV. DR. PARET).

BISHOP OF FREDERICTON (RT. REV. DR. MEDLEY), *Metropolitan*.
 BISHOP OF ONTARIO (RT. REV. DR. LEWIS).
 BISHOP OF QUEBEC (RT. REV. DR. WILLIAMS).
 BISHOP OF TORONTO (RT. REV. DR. SWEATMAN).
 BISHOP OF ALGOMA (RT. REV. DR. SULLIVAN).
 BISHOP OF HURON (RT. REV. DR. BALDWIN).
 BISHOP OF NIAGARA (RT. REV. DR. HAMILTON).
 BISHOP OF NOVA SCOTIA (RT. REV. DR. COURTNEY).
 BISHOP COADJUTOR OF FREDERICTON (RT. REV. DR. KINGDON).

BISHOP OF CALCUTTA (RT. REV. DR. JOHNSON), *Metropolitan*.
 BISHOP OF COLOMBO (RT. REV. DR. COPLESTON).
 BISHOP OF BOMBAY (RT. REV. DR. MYLNE).
 BISHOP OF TRAVANCORE & COCHIN (RT. REV. DR. SPEECHLY).
 BISHOP OF RANGOON (RT. REV. DR. STRACHAN).

BISHOP OF GUIANA (RT. REV. DR. AUSTIN), *Metropolitan*.
 BISHOP OF ANTIGUA (RT. REV. DR. JACKSON).
 BISHOP OF TRINIDAD (RT. REV. DR. RAWLE).
 BISHOP OF JAMAICA (RT. REV. DR. NUTTALL).
 BISHOP OF BARBADOS (RT. REV. DR. BREE).
 BISHOP OF NASSAU (RT. REV. DR. CHURTON).
 BISHOP COADJUTOR OF ANTIGUA (RT. REV. DR. BRANCH).

BISHOP OF SYDNEY (RT. REV. DR. BARRY), *Metropolitan*.
 BISHOP OF NORTH QUEENSLAND (RT. REV. DR. STANTON).
 BISHOP OF ADELAIDE (RT. REV. DR. KENNION).
 BISHOP OF BRISBANE (RT. REV. DR. WEBBER).

BISHOP OF NELSON (RT. REV. DR. SUTER).
 BISHOP OF AUCKLAND (RT. REV. DR. COWIE).
 BISHOP OF DUNEDIN (RT. REV. DR. NEVILLE).
 BISHOP OF WAIAPU (RT. REV. DR. STUART).

BISHOP OF CAPETOWN (RT. REV. DR. W. W. JONES), *Metropolitan*.
 BISHOP OF MARITZBURG (RT. REV. DR. MACROBIE).
 BISHOP OF GRAHAMSTOWN (RT. REV. DR. WEBB).
 BISHOP OF PRETORIA (RT. REV. DR. BOUSFIELD).
 BISHOP OF ZULULAND (RT. REV. DR. MACKENZIE).
 BISHOP OF ST. JOHN'S, KAFFRARIA (RT. REV. DR. KEY).

BISHOP OF RUPERTSLAND (RT. REV. DR. MACHRAY), *Metropolitan*.
 BISHOP OF MOOSONEE (RT. REV. DR. HORDEN).
 BISHOP OF QU'APPELLE (RT. REV. AND HON. DR. ANSON).
 BISHOP OF SASKATCHEWAN & CALGARY (RT. REV. DR. PINKHAM).

BISHOP OF COLUMBIA (RT. REV. DR. HILLS).
 MISSIONARY BISHOP IN THE NIGER TERRITORY (RT. REV. DR. CROWTHER).
 BISHOP OF THE FALKLAND ISLANDS (RT. REV. DR. STIRLING).
 BISHOP OF HONOLULU (RT. REV. DR. WILLIS).
 BISHOP OF GIBRALTAR (RT. REV. DR. SANDFORD).
 BISHOP OF NEWFOUNDLAND (RT. REV. DR. LLEWELLYN JONES).
 BISHOP OF CALEDONIA (RT. REV. DR. RIDLEY).
 BISHOP OF NEW WESTMINSTER (RT. REV. DR. SILLITOE).
 MISSIONARY BISHOP IN NORTH CHINA (RT. REV. DR. SCOTT).
 BISHOP OF SINGAPORE AND SARAWAK (RT. REV. DR. HOSE).
 BISHOP OF SIERRA LEONE (RT. REV. DR. INGHAM).
 MISSIONARY BISHOP IN CENTRAL AFRICA (RT. REV. DR. SMYTHIES).
 MISSIONARY BISHOP IN JAPAN (RT. REV. DR. E. BICKERSTETH).
 BISHOP OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND IN JERUSALEM AND THE EAST (RT. REV. DR. BLYTH).

Officers of the Conference:

BISHOP OF GLOUCESTER AND BRISTOL (RT. REV. DR. ELICOTT),
Episcopal Secretary.
 DEAN OF WINDSOR (VERY REV. R. T. DAVIDSON), *General Secretary*.
 ARCHDEACON OF MAIDSTONE (VEN. B. F. SMITH), *Assistant Secretary*.

LETTER.

TO THE FAITHFUL IN CHRIST JESUS, GREETING—

WE, Archbishops, Bishops Metropolitan, and other Bishops of the Holy Catholic Church, in full communion with the Church of England, one hundred and forty-five in number, all having superintendence over Dioceses or lawfully commissioned to exercise Episcopal functions therein, assembled from divers parts of the earth, at Lambeth Palace, in the year of our Lord 1888, under the presidency of the Most Reverend Edward, by Divine Providence Archbishop of Canterbury, Primate of all England and Metropolitan, after receiving in the Chapel of the said Palace the Blessed Sacrament of the Lord's Body and Blood, and uniting in prayer for the guidance of the Holy Spirit, have taken into consideration various questions which have been submitted to us affecting the welfare of God's people and the condition of the Church in divers parts of the world.

We have made these matters the subject of careful and serious deliberation during the month past, both in general Conference and in Committees specially appointed to consider the several questions; and we now commend to the faithful the conclusions at which we have arrived.

We have appended to this letter two sets of documents, the one containing the formal Resolutions of the Conference, and the other the Reports of the several Committees. We desire you to

bear in mind that the Conference is responsible for the first alone. The Reports of Committees can only be taken to represent the mind of the Conference in so far as they are reaffirmed or directly adopted in the Resolutions; but we have thought good to print these Reports, believing that they will offer fruitful matter for consideration.

In the first place we desire to speak of the moral and practical questions which have engaged the attention of the Conference; and in the forefront we would place the duty of the Church in the promotion of temperance and purity.

Temperance. Noble and self-denying efforts have been made for many years, within and without the Church, for the suppression of intemperance, and it is our earnest hope that these efforts will be increased manifold. The evil effects of this sin on the life of the Church and the nation can scarcely be exaggerated. But we are constrained to utter a caution against a false principle which threatens to creep in and vitiate much useful work. Highly valuable as we believe total abstinence to be as a means to an end, we desire to discountenance the language which condemns the use of wine as wrong in itself, independently of its effects on ourselves or on others, and we have expressed our disapproval of a reported practice (which seems to be due to some extent to the tacit assumption of this principle) of substituting some other liquid in the celebration of Holy Communion.

Purity. On the other hand Christian society is only now awakening to a sense of its active duty in the matter of purity; and we therefore desire to avail ourselves of an occasion which has brought together representatives of the Anglican Communion from distant parts of the world, to

proclaim a crusade against that sin which is before all others a defilement of the body of Christ and a desecration of the temple of the Holy Spirit. We recall the earnest language of the Report : we believe that nothing short of general action by all Christian people will avail to arrest the evil : we call upon you to rally round the standard of a high and pure morality ; and we appeal to all whom our voice may reach to assist us in raising the tone of public opinion, and in stamping out ignoble and corrupt traditions which are not only a dishonour to the Name of our Master Christ, but degrading to the dignity of a being created in the image of God.

Sanctity of Marriage. In vital connection with the promotion of purity is the maintenance of the sanctity of marriage, which is the centre of social morality. This is seriously compromised by facilities of Divorce which have been increased in recent years by legislation in some countries. We have therefore held it our duty to reaffirm emphatically the precept of Christ relating thereto, and to offer some advice which may guide the Clergy of our Communion in their attitude towards any infringement of the Master's rule.

Polygamy. The sanctity of marriage as a Christian obligation implies the faithful union of one man with one woman until the union is severed by death. The polygamous alliances of heathen races are allowed on all hands to be condemned by the law of Christ ; but they present many difficult practical problems which have been solved in various ways in the past. We have carefully considered this question in the different lights thrown upon it from various parts of the mission-field. While we have refrained from offering advice on minor points, leaving these to

be settled by the local authorities of the Church, we have laid down some broad lines on which alone we consider that the missionary may safely act. Our first care has been to maintain and protect the Christian conception of marriage, believing that any immediate and rapid successes which might otherwise have been secured in the mission-field would be dearly purchased by any lowering or confusion of this idea.

Observance of the Lord's Day. The due observance of Sunday as a day of rest, of worship, and of religious teaching has a direct bearing on the moral well-being of the Christian community. We have observed of late a growing laxity which threatens to impair its sacred character. We strongly deprecate this tendency. We call upon the leisurely classes not selfishly to withdraw from others the opportunities of rest and of religion. We call upon master and employer jealously to guard the privileges of the servant and the workman. In "the Lord's Day" we have a priceless heritage. Whoever misuses it incurs a terrible responsibility.

Socialism. Intimately connected with these moral questions is the attitude of the Christian Church towards the social problems of the day. Excessive inequality in the distribution of this world's goods: vast accumulation and desperate poverty side by side: these suggest many anxious considerations to any thoughtful person, who is penetrated with the mind of Christ. No more important problems can well occupy the attention—whether of Clergy or Laity—than such as are connected with what is popularly called Socialism. To study schemes proposed for redressing the social balance, to welcome the good which may be found in the aims or operations of any, and

to devise methods, whether by legislation or by social combinations, or in any other way, for a peaceful solution of the problems without violence or injustice, is one of the noblest pursuits which can engage the thoughts of those who strive to follow in the footsteps of Christ. Suggestions are offered in the Report, which may assist in solving this problem.

Care of Emigrants. One class of persons more especially had a claim upon the consideration and sympathy of the Conference. In our emigrants we have a social link which binds the Churches of the British Islands to the Church of the United States, and to the Churches in the Colonies. No more pertinent question, therefore, could have been suggested for our deliberations than our duty towards this large body of our fellow-Christians. It is especially incumbent upon the Church to follow them with the eye of sympathy at every point in their passage from their old home to their new, to exercise a watchful care over them, and to protect them from the dangers, moral and spiritual, which beset their path. We have endeavoured to offer some suggestions, by following which this end may be attained.

Definite Teaching of the Faith. Recognising thus the primary importance of maintaining the moral precepts and discipline of the Gospel in all the relations of life and society, we proceed to the consideration of the means, within the reach and contemplation of the Churches, for inculcating the definite truths of the Faith, which are the basis of such moral teaching.

We cannot escape the conviction that this department of work requires great attention and much improvement. The religious teaching of the young is sadly deficient in depth and reality,

especially in the matter of doctrine. This deficiency is not confined to any class of society, and the task of remedying the default is one which the Laity must be prepared to share with the Clergy. On parents it lies as a divine charge. Godfathers and Godmothers should be urged to fulfil the duty which they have undertaken for the children whose sponsors they have been, and to see that they are not left uninstructed, or inadequately prepared for Confirmation. The use of public catechising and regular preparation of candidates for Confirmation is capable of much development. The work done in Sunday Schools requires, as we believe, more constant supervision and more sustained interest than, in a great many cases, it receives from the Clergy. The instruction of Sunday-School teachers, and of the pupil-teachers in Elementary Schools, ought to be regarded as an indispensable part of the pastoral work of a Parish Priest; and the moral and practical lessons from the Bible ought to be enforced by constant reference to the sanctions, and to the illustrations of doctrine and discipline belonging to them, to be found in the same Holy Scripture. It would be possible, to a greater extent than is now done, to make sermons in church combine doctrinal and moral efficiency, and, by illustrating the rationale of divine service, lead on the congregations to the perception of the definite relations between worship, faith, and work—the lessons of the Prayer Book, the Catechism, and the Creeds.

It is not, however, with reference to the young alone, or to the recognised members of their own flock, that the Clergy have need to look carefully to the security of definiteness in teaching the faith.

The study of Holy Scripture is a great part of the mental discipline of the Christian, and the Bible itself is the main instrument in all teaching

of religion. Unhappily, in the present day, there is a widespread system of propagandism hostile to the reception of the Bible as a treasury of Divine knowledge, and throughout society, in all its ranks, misgivings, doubts, hostile criticisms, and sceptical estimates of doctrinal truths as based on Revelation, are very common.

The doubts which arise from the misapprehension of the due relations between science and Revelation may be, and ought to be, treated with respect and a sympathetic patience; and, where minds have been disquieted by scientific discovery or assertion, great care should be taken not to extinguish the elements of faith, but rather to direct the thinker to the realisation of the fact that such discoveries elucidate the action of laws which, rightly conceived, tend to the higher appreciation of the glorious work of the Creator, upheld by the word of His power.

The dangers arising from the hostile or sceptical temper and attitude are increased by the difficulty of determining how far our teaching and the popular acceptance of it can be harmonised with a due consideration for the views on inspiration, and especially on the character of the discipline of the Old Testament dispensation, which, although they have never received definite sanction in the Church, have been long and widely prevalent.

We must recommend to the Clergy cautious and industrious treatment of these points of controversy, and most earnestly press upon them the importance of taking, as the central thought of their teaching, our Lord Jesus Christ, as the sacrifice for our sins, as the healer of our sinfulness, the source of all our spiritual life, and the revelation to our consciences of the law and motive of all moral virtue. To Him and to His

work all the teachings of the Old Testament converge, and from Him all the teachings of the New Testament flow, in spirit, in force, and in form. The work of the Church is the application and extension of the blessings of the Incarnation, and her teaching the development of its doctrinal issues as contained in the Creeds of the Church.

Mutual Relations. Our discussion on the mutual relations of dioceses and branches of our Communion has brought out some points which we desire to commend to your consideration. It appears necessary to draw attention to the principles laid down in the Conference of 1878, and to urge that within our Communion the duly-certified action of each Church or Province should be respected by the other Churches and their members; that no Bishop or Clergyman should exercise his functions within any regularly-constituted diocese without the consent of the Bishop of that diocese; and that no Bishop should authorise the action of any Clergyman coming from another diocese without proper letters testimonial. The neglect of these rules has led to some grievous scandals. The Bishops, on their part, are prepared to do their best to guard against such mischiefs, by adding private advice to the formal document in use, but the Clergy must resolve to exercise greater caution in signing testimonials; and those who require them must check all tendency to over-sensitiveness, when they find themselves subjected to inquiries as to character and identification, which, however unnecessary they may deem them in their own case, are certainly indispensable for securing such measure of safety as we require.

This caution applies with especial force to the Clergy ordained for colonial work. We most heartily recognise the principle that those who

have given the best years of their life to work abroad are entitled to great consideration when the time comes at which they want such rest or change of employment as may be found at home. But to lay down any general rules on this point is impossible.

One matter has been laid before us in a more formal way—the possibility of constituting a Council or Councils of reference to advise upon, or even to decide, questions laid before them by the authorities of the Provinces of the Colonial Church. As to this, we would counsel patient consideration and consultation, of such character as may eventually supersede the necessity for creating an authority which might, whether as a Council of advice, or in a function more closely resembling that of a Court, place us in circumstances prejudicial alike to order and to liberty of action.

Home Reunion. After anxious discussion we have resolved to content ourselves with laying down certain articles as a basis on which approach may be, by God's blessing, made towards Home Reunion. These articles, four in number, will be found in the appended Resolutions.

The attitude of the Anglican Communion towards the religious bodies now separated from it by unhappy divisions would appear to be this:— We hold ourselves in readiness to enter into brotherly conference with any of those who may desire intercommunion with us in a more or less perfect form. We lay down conditions on which such intercommunion is, in our opinion, and according to our conviction, possible. For, however we may long to embrace those now alienated from us, so that the ideal of the one flock under the one Shepherd may be realised, we must not be unfaithful stewards of the great deposit entrusted

to us. We cannot desert our position either as to faith or discipline. That concord would, in our judgment, be neither true nor desirable which should be produced by such surrender.

But we gladly and thankfully recognise the real religious work which is carried on by Christian bodies not of our Communion. We cannot close our eyes to the visible blessing which has been vouchsafed to their labours for Christ's sake. Let us not be misunderstood on this point. We are not insensible to the strong ties, the rooted convictions, which attach them to their present position. These we respect, as we wish that on our side our own principles and feelings may be respected. Competent observers, indeed, assert that not in England only, but in all parts of the Christian world, there is a real yearning for unity—that men's hearts are moved more than heretofore towards Christian fellowship. The Conference has shown in its discussions as well as its resolutions that it is deeply penetrated with this feeling. May the Spirit of Love move on the troubled waters of religious differences.

Relation to the Scandinavian Church. Among the nations with whom English-speaking peoples are brought directly in contact are the Scandinavian races, who form an important element of the population in many of our dioceses. The attitude, therefore, which the Anglican Communion should take towards the Scandinavian Churches could not be a matter of indifference to this Conference. We have recommended that fuller knowledge should be sought and friendly intercourse interchanged until such time as matters may be ripe for a closer alliance without any sacrifice of principles which we hold to be essential.

To Old Catholics and Others. Nor, again, is it possible

for members of the Anglican Communion to withhold their sympathies from those Continental movements towards Reformation which, under the greatest difficulties, have proceeded mainly on the same lines as our own, retaining Episcopacy as an Apostolic ordinance. Though we believe that the time has not come for any direct alliance with any of these, and, though we deprecate any precipitancy of action which would transgress primitive and established principles of jurisdiction, we believe that advances may be made without sacrifice of these, and we entertain the hope that the time may come when a more formal alliance with some at least of these bodies will be possible.

To the Eastern Churches. The Conference has expressed its earnest desire to confirm and to improve the friendly relations which now exist between the Churches of the East and the Anglican Communion. These Churches have well earned the sympathy of Christendom, for through long ages of persecution they have kept alive in many a dark place the light of the Gospel. If that light is here and there feeble or dim, there is all the more reason that we, as we have opportunity, should tend and cherish it; and we need not fear that our offices of brotherly charity, if offered in a right spirit, will not be accepted. We reflect with thankfulness that there exist no bars, such as are presented to communion with the Latins by the formulated sanction of the Infallibility of the Church residing in the person of the supreme pontiff, by the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception, and other dogmas imposed by the decrees of Papal Councils. The Church of Rome has always treated her Eastern sister wrongfully. She intrudes her Bishops into the ancient Dioceses, and keeps up a system of

active proselytism. The Eastern Church is reasonably outraged by these proceedings, wholly contrary as they are to Catholic principles; and it behoves us of the Anglican Communion to take care that we do not offend in like manner.

Individuals craving fuller light and stronger spiritual life may, by remaining in the Church of their baptism, become centres of enlightenment to their own people.

But though all schemes of proselytising are to be avoided, it is only right that our real claims and position as a historical Church should be set before a people who are very distrustful of novelty, especially in religion, and who appreciate the history of Catholic antiquity. Help should be given towards the education of the Clergy, and, in more destitute communities, extended to schools for general instruction.

Authoritative Standards. The authoritative standards of doctrine and worship claim your careful attention in connection with these subjects. It is of the utmost importance that our faith and practice should be represented, both to the ancient Churches and to the native and growing Churches in the mission-field, in a manner which shall neither give cause for offence nor restrict due liberty, nor present any stumbling-blocks in the way of complete communion.

In conformity with the practice of the former Conferences we declare that we are united under our Divine Head in the fellowship of the one Catholic and Apostolic Church, holding the one Faith revealed in Holy Writ, defined in the Creeds, maintained by the primitive Church, and affirmed by the undisputed Œcumenical Councils: as standards of doctrine and worship alike we recognise the Prayer Book with its Catechism, the

Ordinal, and the Thirty-nine Articles,—the special heritage of the Church of England, and, to a greater or less extent, received by all the Churches of our Communion.

We desire that these standards should be set before the foreign Churches in their purity and simplicity. A certain liberty of treatment must be extended to the cases of native and growing Churches, on which it would be unreasonable to impose, as conditions of communion, the whole of the Thirty-nine Articles, coloured as they are in language and form by the peculiar circumstances under which they were originally drawn up. On the other hand it would be impossible for us to share with them in the matter of Holy Orders, as in complete intercommunion, without satisfactory evidence that they hold substantially the same form of doctrine as ourselves. It ought not to be difficult, much less impossible, to formulate articles, in accordance with our own standards of doctrine and worship, the acceptance of which should be required of all ordained in such Churches.

We close this letter rendering our humble and hearty thanks to Almighty God for His great goodness towards us. We have been permitted to meet together in larger numbers than heretofore. Contributions of knowledge and experience have been poured into the common stock from all parts of the earth. We have realised, more fully than it was possible to realise before, the extent, the power, and the influence of the great Anglican Communion. We have felt its capacities, its opportunities, its privileges. In our common deliberations we have tested its essential oneness amidst all varieties of condition and development. Wherever there was diversity of opinion among us there was also harmony of spirit and unity of

aim ; and we shall return to our several dioceses refreshed, strengthened, and inspired by the memories which we shall carry away.

But the sense of thanksgiving is closely linked with the obligation of duty. This fuller realisation of our privileges as members of the Anglican Communion carries with it a heightened sense of our responsibilities which do not end with our own people or with the mission-field alone, but extend to all the Churches of God. The opportunities of an exceptional position call us to an exceptional work. It is our earnest prayer that all—Clergy and laity alike—may take God's manifest purpose to heart, and strive in their several stations to work it out in all its fulness.

With these parting words we commend the results at which we have arrived in this Conference to your careful consideration, praying that the Holy Spirit may direct your thoughts and lead you to all truth, and that our counsels may redound through your action to the glory of God and the increase of Christ's kingdom.

Signed, on behalf of the Conference,

EDW : CANTUAR :

C. J. GLOUCESTER & BRISTOL,
Episcopal Secretary.

RANDALL T. DAVIDSON,
Dean of Windsor,
General Secretary.

B. F. SMITH,
Archdeacon of Maidstone,
Assistant Secretary.

RESOLUTIONS FORMALLY ADOPTED BY
THE CONFERENCE.

1. That this Conference, without pledging itself to all the statements and opinions embodied in the Report of the Committee on Intemperance, commends the Report to the consideration of the Church.
 2. That the Bishops assembled in this Conference declare that the use of unfermented juice of the grape, or any liquid other than true wine diluted or undiluted, as the element in the administration of the cup in Holy Communion, is unwarranted by the example of Our Lord, and is an unauthorised departure from the custom of the Catholic Church.
-
3. That this Conference earnestly commends to all those into whose hands it may come the Report on the subject of Purity, as expressing the mind of the Conference on this great subject.*
[*Carried unanimously.]
-
4. (A) That, inasmuch as Our Lord's words expressly forbid Divorce, except in the case of fornication or adultery, the Christian Church cannot recognise Divorce in any other than the excepted case, or give any sanction to the marriage of any person who has been divorced contrary to this law, during the life of the other party.

- (B) That under no circumstances ought the guilty party, in the case of a divorce for fornication or adultery, to be regarded, during the lifetime of the innocent party, as a fit recipient of the blessing of the Church on marriage.
- (C) That, recognising the fact that there always has been a difference of opinion in the Church on the question whether Our Lord meant to forbid marriage to the innocent party in a divorce for adultery, the Conference recommends that the Clergy should not be instructed to refuse the Sacraments or other privileges of the Church to those who, under civil sanction, are thus married.
-
5. (A) That it is the opinion of this Conference that persons living in polygamy be not admitted to baptism, but that they be accepted as candidates and kept under Christian instruction until such time as they shall be in a position to accept the law of Christ.*
- [*Carried by 83 votes to 21.]
- (B) That the wives of polygamists may, in the opinion of this Conference, be admitted in some cases to baptism, but that it must be left to the local authorities of the Church to decide under what circumstances they may be baptised.*
- [*Carried by 54 votes to 34.]
-
6. (A) That the principle of the religious observance of one day in seven, embodied in the Fourth Commandment, is of Divine obligation.
- (B) That, from the time of our Lord's Resurrection, the first day of the week was observed by

Christians as a day of worship and rest, and, under the name of "The Lord's Day," gradually succeeded, as the great weekly festival of the Christian Church, to the sacred position of the Sabbath.

- (C) That the observance of the Lord's Day as a day of rest, of worship, and of religious teaching, has been a priceless blessing in all Christian lands in which it has been maintained.
- (D) That the growing laxity in its observance threatens a great change in its sacred and beneficent character.
- (E) That especially the increasing practice, on the part of some of the wealthy and leisurely classes, of making Sunday a day of secular amusement is most strongly to be deprecated.
- (F) That the most careful regard should be had to the danger of any encroachment upon the rest which, on this day, is the right of servants as well as their masters, and of the working classes as well as their employers.

7. That this Conference receives the Report drawn up by the Committee on the subject of Socialism, and submits it to the consideration of the Churches of the Anglican Communion.

8. That this Conference receives the Report drawn up by the Committee on the subject of Emigration, and commends the suggestions embodied in it to the consideration of the Churches of the Anglican Communion.

9. (A) That this Conference receives the Report drawn up by the Committee on the subject of the Mutual Relation of Dioceses and Branches of the Anglican Communion, and submits it to the consideration of the Church, as containing suggestions of much practical importance.
- (B) That the Archbishop of Canterbury be requested to give his attention to the Appendix attached to the Report, with a view to action in the direction indicated, if, upon consideration, His Grace should think such action desirable.
10. That, inasmuch as the Book of Common Prayer is not the possession of one Diocese or Province, but of all, and that a revision in one portion of the Anglican Communion must therefore be extensively felt, this Conference is of opinion that no particular portion of the Church should undertake revision without seriously considering the possible effect of such action on other branches of the Church.
-

11. That, in the opinion of this Conference, the following Articles supply a basis on which approach may be by God's blessing made towards Home Reunion :—

- (A) The Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, as "containing all things necessary to salvation," and as being the rule and ultimate standard of faith.
- (B) The Apostles' Creed, as the Baptismal Symbol ; and the Nicene Creed, as the sufficient statement of the Christian faith.

- (c) The two Sacraments ordained by Christ Himself—Baptism and the Supper of the Lord—ministered with unfailing use of Christ's words of Institution, and of the elements ordained by Him.
- (d) The Historic Episcopate, locally adapted in the methods of its administration to the varying needs of the nations and peoples called of God into the Unity of His Church.
12. That this Conference earnestly requests the constituted authorities of the various branches of our Communion, acting, so far as may be, in concert with one another, to make it known that they hold themselves in readiness to enter into brotherly conference (such as that which has already been proposed by the Church in the United States of America) with the representatives of other Christian Communions in the English-speaking races, in order to consider what steps can be taken, either towards corporate Reunion, or towards such relations as may prepare the way for fuller organic unity hereafter.
13. That this Conference recommends as of great importance, in tending to bring about Reunion, the dissemination of information respecting the standards of doctrine and the formularies in use in the Anglican Church; and recommends that information be disseminated, on the other hand, respecting the authoritative standards of doctrine, worship, and government adopted by the other bodies of Christians into which the English-speaking races are divided.
-

14. That, in the opinion of this Conference, earnest efforts should be made to establish more friendly relations between the Scandinavian and Anglican Churches; and that approaches on the part of the Swedish Church, with a view to the mutual explanation of differences, be most gladly welcomed, in order to the ultimate establishment, if possible, of intercommunion on sound principles of ecclesiastical polity.
15. (A) That this Conference recognises with thankfulness the dignified and independent position of the Old Catholic Church of Holland, and looks to more frequent brotherly intercourse to remove many of the barriers which at present separate us.*
- (B) That we regard it as a duty to promote friendly relations with the Old Catholic Community in Germany, and with the "Christian Catholic Church" in Switzerland, not only out of sympathy with them, but also in thankfulness to God Who has strengthened them to suffer for the truth under great discouragements, difficulties, and temptations; and that we offer them the privileges recommended by the Committee under the conditions specified in its Report.*
- (C) That the sacrifices made by the Old Catholics in Austria deserve our sympathy, and that we hope, when their organisation is sufficiently tried and complete, a more formal relation may be found possible.*
- (D) That, with regard to the reformers in Italy, France, Spain, and Portugal, struggling to free themselves from the burden of unlawful terms

of communion, we trust that they may be enabled to adopt such sound forms of doctrine and discipline, and to secure such Catholic organisation as will permit us to give them a fuller recognition.*

- (E) That, without desiring to interfere with the rights of Bishops of the Catholic Church to interpose in cases of extreme necessity, we deprecate any action that does not regard primitive and established principles of jurisdiction and the interests of the whole Anglican Communion.*

[*Resolutions (A) (B) (C) (D) (E) were carried *nemine contradicente*.]

16. That, having regard to the fact that the question of the relation of the Anglican Church to the *Unitas Fratrum*, or Moravians, was remitted by the last Lambeth Conference to a Committee, which has hitherto presented no Report on the subject, the Archbishop of Canterbury be requested to appoint a Committee of Bishops who shall be empowered to confer with learned theologians, and with the heads of the *Unitas Fratrum*, and shall report to His Grace before the end of the current year, and that His Grace be requested to take such action on their Report as he shall deem right.
17. That this Conference, rejoicing in the friendly communications which have passed between the Archbishops of Canterbury and other Anglican Bishops, and the Patriarchs of Constantinople and other Eastern Patriarchs and Bishops, desires to express its hope that the barriers to fuller communion may be, in

course of time, removed by further intercourse and extended enlightenment. The Conference commends this subject to the devout prayers of the faithful, and recommends that the counsels and efforts of our fellow-Christians should be directed to the encouragement of internal reformation in the Eastern Churches, rather than to the drawing away from them of individual members of their Communion.

18. That the Archbishop of Canterbury be requested to take counsel with such persons as he may see fit to consult, with a view to ascertaining whether it is desirable to revise the English version of the Nicene Creed or of the *Quicumque Vult*.*

[* Carried by 57 votes to 20.]

19. That, as regards newly-constituted Churches, especially in non-Christian lands, it should be a condition of the recognition of them as in complete intercommunion with us, and especially of their receiving from us Episcopal Succession, that we should first receive from them satisfactory evidence that they hold substantially the same doctrine as our own, and that their Clergy subscribe Articles in accordance with the express statements of our own standards of doctrine and worship ; but that they should not necessarily be bound to accept in their entirety the thirty-nine Articles of Religion.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

N.B.—*The following Reports must be taken as having the authority only of the Committees by whom they were respectively prepared and presented. The Committees were not in every case unanimous in adopting the Reports.*

The Conference, as a whole, is responsible only for the formal Resolutions agreed to after discussion, and printed above, pages 21 to 28.

NO. I.—INTEMPERANCE.

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE* APPOINTED TO CONSIDER
THE SUBJECT OF THE DUTY OF THE CHURCH
WITH REGARD TO INTEMPERANCE.

It is not necessary to say much of the sinfulness of intemperance in itself, or of the wide-spread mischief that is caused by it. If it cannot be considered the most sinful of all sins, it is difficult to deny that it is the most mischievous. And wherever large masses of the population find it difficult to obtain work at all, and large masses can only obtain it at wages too low to sustain healthy life, the evils caused by intemperance press with heavier weight than ever they did before. The Church cannot be justified in witnessing this enormous amount of sin and misery without endeavouring to ascertain whether any special means can be discovered for effectually dealing with it, or whether it must be left to ordinary agencies used with more than ordinary zeal and persistency.

The experience of the last fifty years is strongly in favour of the use of the special means which have hitherto achieved whatever success has been achieved

* Names of the Members of the Committee :—

Bishop of London (<i>Chairman</i>).	Bishop of Rochester.
„ Colorado.	„ Saskatchewan.
„ Kilmore.	„ Sierra Leone.
„ Newcastle.	„ Sodor and Man.
„ The Niger.	„ Zululand.
„ Pennsylvania.	

in stemming the strong current of this widely-prevailing sin. It may be true that, if the whole Church had been thoroughly alive to the extent and nature of the mischief, much might have been done by more earnest efforts both of Clergy and Laity in the ordinary course of the Church's work. But it is the perseverance and insistence of the Temperance Societies that has awakened the Church, and without these Societies we have no evidence to show that much or even anything would have been done to deal with the evil. The Temperance Societies have compelled the attention of the public at large, and have by so doing profoundly modified public opinion. There can be no doubt that drunkenness is now regarded with much more severe condemnation than before these Societies began their work, and the change is largely, if not entirely, due to them. The Temperance Societies have compelled the medical profession to study the subject with more care than before, and the result of this study has greatly influenced both their utterances and their practice. The science of medicine is so complex and difficult, and the practice of medicine has been so largely influenced by tradition, that any particular question, such as that of the influence of alcohol on the body, has to wait its turn for examination unless some strong reason forces it forward. But the urgency of the Temperance Societies drew the attention of the profession, and the result has justified that urgency. To the Temperance Societies is due the change in the practice of Insurance Offices. Fifty years ago it was their ordinary rule to require higher premiums from life-insurers who totally abstained from intoxicating liquors. It is now proved that the total abstainers live longer than other men. And this has been confirmed by the experience of the Benefit Societies among which those

that make total abstinence a condition of membership are able to show a much smaller average of sickness than the others. And to all this is to be added the great and still-increasing effect of the Bands of Hope which, though in some cases open to objection, are, nevertheless, every year adding largely to the number of pledged abstainers among adults, and bid fair before long entirely to change the public opinion of the classes that live by manual labour.

And it is natural that this should be so, for the sin, being one of the sins of the flesh, must be dealt with, as indeed all such sins must be dealt with, mainly by flight from temptation. The special characteristic of all temptations of the flesh is the enormous difference in power between temptations close at hand and temptations at a distance. If a man is weak in this respect the one hope of his safety lies in keeping the temptation from him, and him from the temptation. There are no doubt many who have no need of this. But those who have fallen or are approaching a fall can, as a rule, be upheld in no other way. Now, this is precisely a work in which men can help each other, and in which that help can most effectually be given by an organisation formed for the purpose. Men can help each other by breaking through those customs of society which now surround men with incessant temptations in every transaction of life, by using their influence to diminish the enormous number of public-houses which now make every street and road a peril to the weak, by diligently investigating the effects of alcoholic drinks on the body, and disproving the assertion that alcohol is necessary (except in rare and special cases) to health or to vigorous action. But even more can men help the weak by sympathy with them in their struggle, and by doing all they can to make

that struggle easier. A weak man is told to abstain altogether; and, easy as this is to many, to some it is exceedingly difficult, and the difficulty to these is greatly increased if they are to abstain quite alone, and thus, apparently, cut themselves off from the rest; if their abstinence is, in itself, to be a kind of stigma, and to brand them with a public exposure of their weakness. Such men need to be shielded and supported by the stronger, or the battle which is often hard enough in any case becomes too much for their strength.

Whatever may be said concerning what might have been done by other methods, it is undeniable that to organisations for the express purpose of dealing with intemperance, and to these organisations alone, must be attributed what has been done. And if any other method of doing the work is to claim precedence it must first establish that claim by actual experience before it will be possible to take cognisance of it in determining the course that the authorities of the Church should recommend. The Temperance Societies are now doing the work, and there is at present no sign of any other mode of doing it being equally likely to succeed.

And after what has been said above it clearly follows that the main weapon to be used in this warfare is the practice of total abstinence from intoxicating liquors by those who desire to help their fellow-men. Nothing but this has the same hold of the weak or the tempted, gives them the same encouragement to fight their battle in the only true way, wins their affections, maintains their perseverance. Exhortations to total abstinence by those who do not themselves abstain are always comparatively feeble, sometimes irritating. The exhorter often fails to win even where perhaps he succeeds

in convincing. The lesson that he teaches is that of moderation, which is an excellent lesson for the strong, but not the lesson which is needed by the weak. He may do something to prevent some from falling who now stand upright; he can do little to save those who are on the edge, or to rescue those who have fallen already.

The burden of the work must be borne by those who are willing to abstain entirely. But, on the other hand, it cannot be said that everyone is bound to take up this particular burden as part of his service of Christ. Some are called to one form of devotion, some to another. There can be no question that everyone who abstains, and makes it known that he abstains for the sake of his weaker fellow-men, is giving them help, and in some cases more help than he knows, yet while men are all bound to help their fellows, they are not all bound to help them in the same manner or in the same degree or against the same enemies. All are bound to help the foreign mission work of the Church, but not all are bound to be missionaries. All are bound to help in spiritual work at home, but all are not called to the same spiritual work. All are bound to help the weak in their battle with intemperance, but not all to help them by total abstinence in their own persons.

It seems reasonable, however, to say that those who are brought much into contact with intemperance should arm themselves with this weapon of total abstinence in their own persons. It would be well that wherever this battle with intemperance is of exceptional importance, or forms for the time the first duty imposed on the Clergy, total abstinence should be the weapon employed. This applies not only to England, but still more to

many places in other parts of the world where native races have to be rescued from previous habits of intemperance, or to be upheld in their struggle to resist temptations of this kind.

There is, however, much work to be done in this cause outside the direct battle with intemperance itself. And the Church cannot stand aloof from it.

It seems to belong to the Church to use its utmost influence to press on all Governments the duty of diminishing the enormous amount of temptation which at present hinders the work of elevating and civilising the masses. There can be no doubt that wise legislation might do a great deal in this direction. The diminution in the number of Public Houses, the shortening of the hours of sale, Sunday Closing, are instances of legislative measures that would probably be very beneficial. And a combination between Governments might wipe out the grievous stain which now rests on the countries that are counted foremost in the world—the stain of degrading and destroying the weaker races. It has pleased God to make the Christian nations stronger than any other—stronger than all others combined. But this strength brings with it a very solemn responsibility. And this solemn responsibility the Church ought incessantly to press on those who bear authority. It is grievous that it should be possible to say, with any most distant resemblance of truth, that it would be better for native races that Christian nations should never come into contact with them at all.

In conclusion, it is of importance to lay much stress on the essential condition of permanent success in this work, namely, that it should be taken up in a religious spirit as part of Christian devotion to the Lord. The

work must be done in His Name for the sake of His children whom He has bought with His Blood. A brief success may be obtained by forgetting the religious character of the task and thinking only of the misery which intemperance causes, and of the degradation inherent in it. But the religious spirit alone will maintain the conflict steadily through the obstinate resistance that will have to be encountered, and in spite of the many disappointments and failures that will have to be borne.

It is, again, the religious spirit which can alone repress the fanaticism which sometimes makes the total abstainer talk of his abstinence as the one thing needful; which sometimes makes him uncharitable and presumptuous; which sometimes makes him think lightly of grievous sin, provided it be not the one sin which he condemns.

But taken up in a religious spirit this work has a double blessing. It is not only blessed in the victory over sin and evil, but blessed also, and perhaps still more, in the door which it opens for the whole Gospel to enter men's souls. The conscience of the mass of the people speaks more clearly on this point than, perhaps, on any other. The Minister of the Gospel who begins with this finds that a very large number are at once ready to accept his teaching, because he carries their consciences with him from the first. They have already learnt that intemperance is wrong, and they are ready to believe in the value of a Ministry which visibly and systematically wages war on it. And having learnt to trust and follow the Minister in this, they are far more ready to trust and follow him in all else. To be all things to all men, in order that he might save some, was St. Paul's rule. And as things now are in many parishes,

and in many parts of the world, the same rule will be best kept by those Ministers of the Church who make a point of showing themselves thoroughly in earnest in this great battle.

Signed on behalf of the Committee,

F. LONDIN:

Chairman.

No. 2.—PURITY.

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE* APPOINTED TO CONSIDER
THE CHURCH'S PRACTICAL WORK IN RELATION TO
THE SUBJECT OF PURITY.

In submitting the following Report your Committee would observe that they have cast it in such a form that, if accepted, it may go forth as the utterance of the united Conference.

We speak as those who are deeply conscious of their responsibility before God for the words which they utter upon a subject of tremendous moment.

Knowing, as we do know, how sins of impurity are not only a grave public scandal, but are also festering beneath the surface, and eating into the life of multitudes in all classes and in all lands, we cannot keep silence, although we dare not utter all that we know.

We are constrained, as Bishops of the Church of God, to lift up the standard of a high and pure morality, and we call upon all, whether of our own Communion or not, in the name of God our common Father, to rally round this standard. Especially do we press

* Names of the Members of the Committee :—

Bishop of Durham. (<i>Chairman</i>).	Bishop of North Dakota.
„ Brechin.	„ Shrewsbury.
„ Calcutta.	„ Toronto.
„ Carlisle.	„ Truro.
„ Marlborough.	„ Wakefield.
„ Massachusetts.	

upon those on whom lies the responsibility of the cure of souls, to face the question, and to ask themselves what they are doing, or can do, to protect their flocks from the deadly ravages of sensual sin.

We believe that, although the public conscience is in some degree awakened, and the self-sacrificing efforts of those who have laboured to this end have not been wholly in vain, yet the awful magnitude of the evil is but imperfectly realised.

We are not blind to the danger of dealing publicly with the subject of impurity. We dread the effect, especially upon the young, of any increased familiarity with the details of sin. Notwithstanding we hold that the time has come when the Church must speak with no uncertain voice.

We solemnly declare that a life of purity is alone worthy of a being created in the image of God.

We declare that for Christians the obligation to purity rests upon the sanctity of the body, which is the "Temple of the Holy Ghost."

We declare that a life of chastity for the unmarried is not only possible, but is commanded by God.

We declare that there is no difference between man and woman in the sinfulness of sins of unchastity.

We declare that on the man, in his God-given strength of manhood, rests the main responsibility.

We declare that no one known to be living an immoral life ought to be received in Christian society.

We solemnly protest against all lowering of the sanctity of marriage.

We would remind all whom our voice may reach that the wrath of God, alike in holy Scripture and in the history of the world, has been revealed against the nations which have transgressed the law of purity;

and we solemnly record our conviction that, wherever marriage is dishonoured and sins of the flesh are lightly regarded, the home-life will be destroyed, and the nation itself will, sooner or later, decay and perish.

We, on our part, as Bishops of the Church of God, satisfied as to the gravity of this matter, and feeling that nothing short of general action on the part of all Christian people will avail to arrest the evil, determine to confer with the Clergy and faithful Laity of our several Diocese as to the wisest steps to be taken for the accomplishment of the weighty enterprise to which God is calling us.

We believe that we may profitably deliberate upon such questions as the following:—

1. How best to bring about a general reformation of manners, and to enforce a higher moral tone in the matter of purity.

2. How especially to guard the sanctity of marriage, and to create a healthier public opinion upon the subject, and, to this end, how best to make the celebration of Holy Matrimony as reverent and impressive as possible.

3. How most wisely to deal with this difficult and delicate question as regards our children, our homes, our schools, and other places of education.

4. How best to strengthen the hands of those who are striving in the Army, the Navy, and other public services, to create and maintain a high standard of purity.

5. How best to provide safeguards for those who, from inability to marry, or from other circumstances of their lives, are exposed to special temptation.

6. How best to bind together, and to encourage by the sense of union, all who desire to help, or to be helped, in the battle against impurity.

7. How best to purify art and literature, and to repress all that is immodest in language, manners, and dress.

8. How best to enforce or amend the laws framed to guard the innocent, to punish the guilty, to rescue the fallen, to suppress the haunts of vice, and to remove temptation from our thoroughfares.

We thank God for the readiness, and even enthusiasm, with which the movement in favour of purity has been welcomed by young men of every class. There is a generosity and chivalry among the young which is seldom appealed to in vain; while large numbers are deeply thankful for every aid in the desperate battle against the sins of the flesh.

Once more, as witnesses for God, we would speak to all whom our voice may reach. "Be strong in the Lord, and in the power of His might." Live pure lives. Speak pure words. Think pure thoughts. Shun and abhor all that is not of perfect modesty. Guard with all jealousy the weak and the young. Above all pray for the sanctifying grace of the Holy Spirit of God, "that your whole spirit and soul and body may be preserved blameless unto the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ."

Signed on behalf of the Committee,

J. B. DUNELM,

Chairman.

No. 3.—DIVORCE.

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE* APPOINTED TO CONSIDER
THE SUBJECT OF DIVORCE.

The Committee appointed to consider the subject of "Divorce, and the question whether it may be practicable to offer any advice or suggestion which may help the Bishops and Clergy towards agreement in their action concerning it," report as follows:—

They think it necessary to call attention to the fact that in very many Christian nations there is evidently a growing laxity of principle and of practice with regard to Divorce, and that in some countries strong attempts have been made to afford further facilities for it, with the result of weakening and lowering, both in law and in popular sentiment, the idea of the sanctity of marriage.

1. They therefore consider it important to declare that, inasmuch as our Lord's words expressly forbid Divorce, except in the case of fornication or adultery, the Christian Church cannot recognise Divorce in any other than the excepted case, or give any sanction to the marriage of any person who has been divorced contrary to this law, during the life of the other party.

2. They would add that under no circumstances

* Names of the Members of the Committee:—

Bishop of Chester (<i>Chairman</i>).	Bishop of Huron.
„ Bombay.	„ Maryland.
„ Dover.	„ Mississippi.
„ Durham.	„ Quincy.
„ Exeter.	„ Singapore.

ought the guilty party, in a case of Divorce for fornication or adultery, to be regarded, during the lifetime of the innocent party, as a fit recipient of the blessing of the Church on marriage.

3. They recognise the fact that there always has been a difference of opinion in the Church on the question whether our Lord meant to forbid marriage to the innocent party in a Divorce for adultery: and they recommend that the Clergy should not be instructed to refuse the Sacraments or other privileges of the Church to those who, under civil sanction, are thus married.

4. But whereas doubt has been entertained whether our Lord meant to permit such marriage to the innocent party, the Committee are unwilling to suggest any precise instructions in this matter, and recommend that, where the laws of the land will permit, the determination should be left to the judgment of the Bishop of the Diocese, whether the Clergy would be justified in refraining from pronouncing the blessing of the Church on such unions.

Signed on behalf of the Committee,

W. CESTR:

Chairman.

No. 4.—POLYGAMY.

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE* APPOINTED TO CONSIDER THE SUBJECT OF POLYGAMY OF HEATHEN CONVERTS.

Your Committee have approached the consideration of the subject submitted to them with an overwhelming sense of their responsibilities ; inasmuch as the question intimately affects the sanctity of marriage, and therefore lies at the root of social morality.

After considering various representations which have been laid before them from divers quarters, they beg leave to report as follows :—

1. Your Committee desire to affirm distinctly that Polygamy is inconsistent with the law of Christ respecting marriage.

2. They cannot find that either the law of Christ or the usage of the early Church would permit the baptism of any man living in the practice of polygamy, even though the polygamous alliances should have been contracted before his conversion.

3. They are well aware that the change from polygamy to monogamy must frequently involve great

* Names of the Members of the Committee :—

Bishop of Durham (<i>Chairman</i>).	Bishop of The Niger.
„ Central Africa.	Bishop Perry.
„ Chester.	Bishop of Sierra Leone.
„ Exeter.	„ South Dakota.
„ Guiana.	„ Travancore.
„ London.	„ Waiapu.
„ Meath.	„ Zululand.
„ Missouri.	

difficulty and even hardship, but they are of opinion that it is not possible to lay down a precise rule to be observed under all circumstances in dealing with this difficulty.

They consequently think that the question of time and manner, which must depend largely on local circumstances, can only be determined by local authority.

4. Your Committee recommend that persons living in polygamy should, on their conversion, be accepted as candidates for Baptism, and kept under Christian instruction until such time as they shall be in a position to accept the law of Christ.

They consider it far better that Baptism should be withheld from such persons, while nevertheless they receive instruction in the truths of the Gospel, than that a measure should be sanctioned which would tend to lower the conception of the Christian law of marriage, and thus inflict an irreparable wound on the morality of the Christian Church in its most vital part.

5. The wives of polygamists may, in the opinion of the Committee, be admitted, in some cases, to Baptism; inasmuch as their position is materially different from that of the polygamist husband. In most countries where polygamy prevails they have no personal freedom to contract or dissolve a matrimonial alliance; and moreover they presumably do not violate the Christian precept which enjoins fidelity to one husband.

6. In carrying into effect the principles here laid down, with due regard to the dictates of love and justice, serious burdens will in some cases be imposed on the Churches, but no trouble, or cost, or self-sacrifice, ought to be spared to make any suffering which may be caused as light and easy to bear as possible.

7. Difficult questions of detail which may arise in

following these recommendations must be left to the decision of the local authorities of the Church, whether Diocesan or Provincial.

8. Throughout this Report polygamy has been taken to mean the union of one man with several wives ; but among some tribes the union of one woman with several husbands is a recognised institution. It will be plain that no such union can be recognised by the Church.

9. It has been represented to your Committee that heathen marriages in many cases do not imply a mutual pledge of life-long fidelity ; and instruction has been asked as to the mode of dealing with such cases on the conversion of the contracting parties, so as to impart a Christian character to the contract. The Committee think it best to leave the local authorities of the Church to determine in what way this end may be best attained ; but they deprecate any course which would tend to impair the validity (within their own sphere) of contracts undertaken prior to conversion, so far as these contracts are not inconsistent with the law of Christ.

10. In laying down the principles which should rule the admission of Christian converts for the future, the Committee have no intention of passing any censure on those who have decided otherwise in the past ; and they desire to leave to individual Bishops the responsibility of dealing with difficulties which may arise in any part of the mission-field from the adoption of a different line of action heretofore by those in authority.

J. B. DUNELM,
Chairman.

No. 5.—SUNDAY OBSERVANCE.

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE* APPOINTED TO CONSIDER
THE SUBJECT OF THE OBSERVANCE OF SUNDAY.

Your Committee have met, and prayerfully considered the subject of the sanctity and observance of the Lord's Day, and have agreed to the following statements of their deliberate judgment on this momentous question, which they submit as their Report:—

1. That the principle of the religious observance of one day in seven is of Divine and primeval obligation, and was afterwards embodied in the Fourth Commandment.
2. That from the time of our Lord's Resurrection the first day of the week was observed as a day of sacred joy by Christians, and was ere long adopted by the Church as the Christian Sabbath or "the Lord's Day."
3. That the observance of the Lord's Day as a day of rest, of worship, and of religious teaching, has been a priceless blessing in all Christian lands in which it has been maintained.
4. That the growing license in its observance threatens a grave change in its sacred and beneficent character.

* Names of the Members of the Committee:—

Bishop of Exeter (<i>Chairman</i>).	Bishop of Indiana.
„ Argyll.	„ Liverpool.
„ Brisbane.	„ Wakefield.
„ Cashel.	„ Washington.

5. That especially the increasing practice on the part of some of the wealthy and leisurely classes of making the day a day of secular amusement is most strongly to be deprecated.
6. That the most careful regard should be had to the danger of any encroachment upon the rest which on this day is the right of servants as well as their masters, and of the working classes as well as their employers.

Signed on behalf of the Committee,

E. H. EXON.,

Chairman.

No. 6.—SOCIALISM.

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE* APPOINTED TO CONSIDER
THE SUBJECT OF THE CHURCH'S PRACTICAL WORK
IN RELATION TO SOCIALISM.

This Committee was directed to report "on the Church's practical work in relation to Socialism." It will be desirable therefore, in the first place, to ascertain, if possible, what is the meaning of Socialism. This, however, is not easy, as the word is used at present in very different senses. When Proudhon was asked, What is Socialism? he replied, "It is every aspiration towards the improvement of society." Laveleye remarks upon this answer, that "Proudhon's definition is too wide:—it omits two characteristics. In the first place, every socialistic doctrine aims at introducing greater equality into social conditions; and, secondly, it tries to realise those reforms by the action of the law or the State." So far, however, as this definition makes the interference of the State a necessary element of Socialism, it is not universally accepted. Schäffle, for instance, says:—"The Alpha and Omega of Socialism is the transformation of private competing capitals into a united collective

* Names of the Members of the Committee:—

[Bishop of Manchester	Bishop of Mississippi.
(<i>Chairman</i>).	" Pittsburgh.
" Brisbane.	" Rochester.
" Carlisle.	" Sydney.
" Derry.	" Wakefield.
" Michigan.	

capital ;" and T. Kirkup, in a thoughtful article on Socialism in the last edition of the *Encyclopædia Britannica*, affirms that "the central aim of Socialism is to terminate the divorce of the workers from the natural sources of subsistence and of culture ;" and, again, he says, "the essence of the theory consists in this—associated production, with a collective capital, with the view to an equitable distribution." Speaking broadly, then, and with reference to such definitions as the preceding, any scheme of social reconstruction may be called Socialism which aims at uniting labour and the instruments of labour (land and capital), whether by means of the State, or of the help of the rich, or of the voluntary co-operation of the poor.

Between Socialism, as thus defined, and Christianity there is obviously no necessary contradiction. Christianity sets forth no theory of the distribution of the instruments or the products of labour ; and if, therefore, some Socialists are found to be in opposition to the Christian religion, this must be due to the accidents and not to the essence of their social creed. Some Socialists are atheists, others advocate loose doctrines as to family ties, others, like the Anarchists, seek to realise their aims, so far as they have any, by undisguised murder and robbery, while, according to some, the very possession of private property is a usurpation and a wrong to the community. With such men the Christian Church can form no alliance. And yet at the same time with what they profess to be their central aim, the improvement of the material and moral condition of the poor, she must have the deepest sympathy. Their methods, indeed, are not hers. Spoliation or injustice in any form is abhorrent alike to her sentiment and belief. She has no faith in

the inherent power of humanity to redeem itself from selfishness. She seeks to make men prosperous and wise and good, not by the force of laws or bayonets, but by the change of individual hearts, and the introduction of a new brotherhood in Christ.

Not the less, however, is she bound, following the teaching of her Master, to aid every wise endeavour which has for its object the material and moral welfare of the poor. Her Master taught her that all men are brethren, not because they share the same blood, but because they have a common Heavenly Father. He further taught her that if any of the members of this spiritual family were greater, richer, or better than the rest, they were bound to use their special means or ability in the service of the whole. "He that is greatest among you," He said, "shall be your servant,"—and that for a special reason, because each disciple was bound to imitate his Divine Master, "Who came not to be ministered unto but to minister, and to give His life a ransom for many."

The Church's practical duty, then, towards Socialism must be determined by the answer to this question, will the union of labour and the instruments of labour tend to improve the material, mental, and moral condition of mankind? Experience seems to show that it will.

It may still, however, be a question, what is the wisest *method* of bringing about this union between labour and its instruments? Two principal schemes have been proposed:—

(1) That labourers shall be encouraged in habits of thrift, in order that with the property thus acquired they may purchase land, or shares in societies for co-operative production.

(2) That the State shall take possession of the whole land and capital of any country, with or without compensation to their former owners; that the property thus nationalised, shall be held in trust for the community by the State, the Commune, or associations of working men; that then the State, the Commune, or the association as the case may be, shall take measures for the preservation, increase, and employment of the common capital, requiring work from each man according to his ability, and bestowing property upon each man according to his needs, or the value of his labour. Minor modifications of this scheme, tending to bring it into closer harmony with the existing state of society, have been proposed by some Socialistic teachers, but still it may be taken as a substantially correct representation of the ultimate aim of very many.

To this second method of uniting labour and its instruments the Committee would urge the following objections:—(1) If full compensation were given to the present holders of property the scheme could hardly be realised, while if full compensation were withheld it would become one of undisguised spoliation. (2) If Government were able to acquire just possession of the whole property of a community, it is difficult to see how the affairs of any great commercial undertaking could be conducted by the State or the Commune with the energy, economy, and sagacious foresight which are necessary to secure success. (3) If all men had to work under State or Communal inspection and compulsion, it would be difficult for them to retain freedom, the sense of parental responsibility, and those numerous traits of individuality which give richness to the human character.

The Committee strongly recommend the adoption of

the first-named method. They believe that it will be well to encourage working men to become possessors of small farms, and of shares in societies for co-operative production in trade and agriculture. They are not unaware that these societies have frequently failed, but they believe that the opinion is not without its weight, that if due care be taken to secure efficient and trustworthy managers, to pay them an adequate salary, and to treat them with a generous confidence, there is no reason why such undertakings should not become successful, as indeed they commonly are now, when their management is in competent hands.

Two objections have been frequently advanced against this method of diminishing the present distress: 1st, that it is unjust to let anyone but the labourer obtain possession of any part of the products of his labour; and, 2ndly, that no man of property or ability ought to seek personal profit from the employment of his special advantages, or ought even to be allowed to become the permanent owner of either land or capital.

The first objection is not tenable. The Committee hold that it is just (1) to pay high wages for exceptional ability; (2) to compensate for his abstinence the man who refrains from consuming his own share of the products of labour, and by so doing makes it possible to maintain and increase the capital of the community; (3) to allow anyone to convert his savings into the form of capital or estate.

The second objection is really founded upon the general spirit of our Lord's teaching—viz., that greatness, ability, or wealth should be made the means of service to the poor and weak without special fee or reward. The Committee fully admit that this is the ideal set before us by our Divine Master, and that it is the end,

towards which we should press, as quickly as the conquest of selfishness will allow us. But they hold that there is no surer cause of failure in practical affairs, than the effort to act on an ideal which has not yet been realised. If the Church is to act safely as well as sublimely, she must take the self-regarding motives with her on the long path by which she advances towards the perfect life of love. She must not assume the existence of what does not yet exist. She must not, like the Anarchists, destroy the whole existing framework of society for the sake of making experiments. Nay, more, she must not ignore the fact that self-regard is the necessary condition of self-preservation, and that her Master's law of moral conduct, that each shall love his neighbour as himself, implies a certain amount of self-regard. Competition is not injurious in itself, it only becomes so when it is unrestricted, when it takes no counsel of the dictates of brotherly love.

The Committee do not doubt that Government can do much to protect the class known as proletarians from the evil effects of unchecked competition. The English poor law has long ago provided the bare necessities of life for those who cannot otherwise obtain them; the institution of State Savings Banks has provided for the poor man a safe investment and moderate return for his savings. Acts of Parliament have required the builders and owners of houses to have regard for the health and comfort of their tenants, while the factory legislation of this country has effectually protected those labourers who cannot protect themselves. The Committee believe, further, that the State may justly and safely extend this protective action in several directions. It may legalise the formation of Boards of Arbitration, to avert the disastrous effects of strikes. It may assist

in the formation and maintenance of technical schools. It may see that powers, already existing, under Sanitary Acts, are more effectually exercised. It may facilitate the acquisition by Municipalities of town lands. The State may even encourage a wider distribution of property by the abolition of entail, where it exists; and it may be questioned whether the system of taxation might not be varied in a sense more favourable to the claims of labourers than that which now exists.

But, after all, the best help is self-help. More even than increase of income, and security of deposit, thrift and self-restraint are the necessary elements of material prosperity. And in encouraging and strengthening such habits and feelings the Church's help is invaluable. By requiring some knowledge of economic science from her candidates for orders; by forming and fostering institutions for the provision of practical education and rational recreation; by establishing penny banks and workmen's guilds; above all, by inducing capitalists to admit their workmen to profit-sharing, and by teaching artisans how to make co-operative production successful, she may do much to diminish discontent, and to increase the feeling of brotherly interest between class and class. The Clergy may enter into friendly relations with Socialists, attending, when possible, their club meetings, and trying to understand their aims and methods. At the same time it will contribute no little to draw together the various classes of society if the Clergy endeavour, in sermons and lectures, to set forth the true principles of Society, showing how property is a trust to be administered for the good of humanity, and how much of what is good and true in Socialism is to be found in the precepts of Christ. The call to aid the weak, through works of what is ordinarily known as charity, has been, at all

times, faithfully pressed by the Church of Christ, and has been met by a noble response, which has been the chief strength of works of beneficence in modern Society. But the matter is one, not merely of Charity, but of Social and Christian Duty. It is in this light that the Church has to proclaim it in these critical times, with some special boldness and earnestness. At the same time the word of warning should not be wanting. Mutual suspicion and the imputation of selfish and unworthy motives keep apart those who have, in fact, a common aim. Intestine strife and doctrines of spoliation destroy confidence, arrest trade, and will but increase misery.

The Committee believe that, in the present condition of thought and knowledge, they cannot wisely or profitably go further than they have done above in the way of detailed suggestion. There is the less temptation to overhaste in forcing on social experiments, inasmuch as the history of the past shows convincingly that the principles of the Gospel contain germs from which Social renovation is surely, if slowly, developed by the continuous action of Christian thought and feeling upon every form of evil and suffering. If all will only labour, under the impulse of Christian love, for the highest benefit of each, we shall advance by the shortest possible path to that better and happier future for which our Master taught us to hope and pray.

Signed on behalf of the Committee,

J. MANCHESTER,

Chairman.

No. 7.—CARE OF EMIGRANTS.

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE* APPOINTED TO CONSIDER
THE CHURCH'S PRACTICAL WORK IN RELATION TO
THE CARE OF EMIGRANTS.

In considering the question of the practical work of the Church in relation to the Care of Emigrants, your Committee have limited their inquiries and the recommendations which they desire to submit to the judgment of the Conference, to those points which bear on the promotion of the religious and moral well-being of our emigrants. They are of opinion that the wider subject of encouraging and assisting emigration is outside the scope of their deliberations, and, even were this not the case, that it is far too large a question to be adequately dealt with in the time at their disposal.

I. In the first place, your Committee feel that they cannot too strongly emphasise the *vast importance of the subject* entrusted to them for consideration. They believe that the problem is one of the most urgent and pressing of the many problems with which the Church has to deal at the present day. And they cannot but think that before many years have passed away, the

* Names of the Members of the Committee :—

Bishop of Llandaff (<i>Chairman</i>).	Bishop of North Dakota.
” Algoma.	” North Queensland.
” Liverpool.	” Pittsburgh.
” Maritzburg.	” Quebec.
” Newark.	” Rupertsland.
” Niagara.	” Sodor and Man.

difficulties of dealing with the problem will be immeasurably increased; and thus it becomes of paramount necessity that the machinery for coping with these difficulties should be organised and set in motion while the extent of emigration is such as to render this possible.

When once the machinery is in good working order, it will then be capable of almost indefinite extension, to meet the increasing demands upon its capacities.

(a) Foremost among the reasons which point to the importance of due provision being made for the spiritual care of our emigrants is this:—Those who leave the British Isles and go forth to seek their fortune in new lands, choose, for the most part, either the United States of America, or Canada, or some of the Colonies of Australia. Of these a very large number are *children of one or another Branch of the Anglican Communion*, and, as such, have a right to expect that the Anglican Church will duly minister to them in whatever part of the world their lot may be cast. An enormous responsibility lies upon the Church in this matter, and it is her duty, so far as in her lies, to prevent estrangement, or any loss of spiritual life in her children, through the accident of their removal from one Branch of the Anglican Church to another.

(b) The simple consideration of the *very large number of emigrants* who have left and who are still leaving British Ports, is a sufficient indication of the immense responsibility of the Church towards them. Since the year of the Battle of Waterloo (1815) the total number of emigrants leaving the United Kingdom has been 11,740,573. But a truer estimate of the great increase in later years is shown from the fact that, during the last 10 years, since the Lambeth Conference of 1878,

3,195,660 out of the above-named 11 millions have left this country. This gives an average of 319,566 emigrants per annum (including British subjects and foreigners). The average is, however, now greatly exceeded every year, as the following figures will show :—

British and Irish Emigrants who have left British Ports in the last 10 years.	<i>Total</i> number of Emigrants, including British subjects and Foreigners, who have left British Ports in the last 10 years.
In 1878 ... 112,902	In 1878 ... 147,663
„ 1879 ... 164,274	„ 1879 ... 217,163
„ 1880 ... 227,542	„ 1880 ... 332,294
„ 1881 ... 243,002	„ 1881 ... 392,514
„ 1882 ... 279,366	„ 1882 ... 413,288
„ 1883 ... 320,118	„ 1883 ... 397,157
„ 1884 ... 242,179	„ 1884 ... 303,901
„ 1885 ... 207,644	„ 1885 ... 264,385
„ 1886 ... 232,900	„ 1886 ... 330,801
„ 1887 ... 281,487	„ 1887 ... 396,494
<hr/>	
<i>Total</i> ... 2,311,414	<i>Total</i> ... 3,195,660
Average per Annum of British and Irish Emigrants } 231,141	Average per Annum of all Emigrants } 319,566

By far the largest proportion of emigrants go to the United States. The percentage, in 1887, to the three chief fields of emigration was as follows :—To the United States, 72 per cent. ; to British North America, 11 per cent. ; to the Australasian Colonies, 12 per cent. ; to all other places, 5 per cent. The following table shows the distribution of the actual number of emigrants in 1887 :—

Emigrants (British and Irish only) 1887.	Total Emigrants (British and Foreign) 1887.
To the United States ... 201,526	To the United States ... 296,901
„ British North America ... 32,025	„ British North America ... 44,406
„ Australasia .. 34,183	„ Australasia . 35,198
„ all other places 13,753	„ all other places 19,989
281,487	396,494

Thus, very nearly three-fourths of the 396,494 people who left the United Kingdom last year were of British or Irish origin, whose spiritual interests the Church cannot properly disregard.

(c) A third reason for urging the importance of the care of our emigrants is the *danger to which they are exposed* between the time of their leaving their old home and the time when they are finally established in their new one.

The dangers on the voyage are by no means inconsiderable. The impossibility, when 500 or more emigrants are carried in one vessel, of separating the reckless and careless from those who are thoughtful and well-disposed, exposes the latter to great temptations. This is especially the case with young unmarried women. Then, again, the dangers are no less great at the port of arrival, where young persons, among strangers and surroundings which are new and unknown, are liable to fall a prey to the unscrupulous men and women who are ever on the watch, at such times, to take advantage of ignorance and innocence. And, perhaps, the greatest danger of all arises from the temptations to intemperance and other vices to which the emigrants are exposed on arrival at their new settlement.

(d) One more point remains to be mentioned under this head, and that is, the enormous *value of the opportunity* afforded by the softening influence which is brought about by the severance of the associations of home and early life, for awakening religious impressions in those who have hitherto been insensible to the Church's teaching, as well as for deepening the spiritual life of those who are true Christians. Wherever this opportunity is taken advantage of, the result is seen in the strengthening of the Church in the country to which the emigrant goes.

Having thus dwelt upon some of the chief reasons why the spiritual care of emigrants is of such supreme importance, your Committee proceed to consider—

What work has already been done in this direction.
What work still remains to be done.

II. Work which has already been done.

Your Committee have pleasure in acknowledging what has already been accomplished in the establishment and continuance of moral and religious work among emigrants. The Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge has organised a plan which is working with much success, and which, when further developed, promises to be of the highest value to the Church. Your Committee desire to express their hearty sense of the gratitude which is due for the admirable work carried on by that Society, which has always been at the head of all religious efforts on behalf of emigrants. They would also acknowledge with thankfulness the meritorious work which has been done by other Societies, especially at the Port of London, and notably that which has been undertaken by the St. Andrew's Water-side Mission.

Without being able to give a complete account of every attempt made to assist and benefit emigrants, it is gratifying to be able to point to the following efforts, which have been successfully carried out, and which have led to valuable results :—

(*a*) Chaplains have been appointed at all the ports of departure in the United Kingdom, whose duty it is to minister to emigrants ; to arrange services for them, both before starting and on the voyage ; to give them introductions to Clergymen abroad ; and generally to arrange for their reception by the Church in the new country to which they are travelling.

(*b*) The Church in the United States of America has initiated a most important work, in having appointed Chaplains at New York, Baltimore, and Philadelphia, whose duty it is to give such spiritual aid as is possible to arriving immigrants, and to commend them further to the Church at their ultimate destination inland.

(*c*) Chaplains who accompany emigrants on the voyage, and who minister to them, and hold frequent services on board, have also been appointed on many vessels going to America, Australia and New Zealand, and the Cape. The great value of having such Chaplains on board is evident, and this is especially the case on the long-voyage ships to Australia and the Cape. The financial burden of the remuneration of these Chaplains is borne by the S.P.C.K.

(*d*) In order to provide due protection for girls and single women emigrating, matrons (other than the regular Government Emigrant Matrons) have from time to time been appointed, who are required to look after their charges during the voyage and on arrival at their destination. The help derived from their protection and the moral influence of the matrons has been largely felt.

In this branch of the work your Committee desire to acknowledge the valuable services rendered by the Girls' Friendly Society.

(e) Clergymen living in all parts of the world have consented to allow persons emigrating to be specially commended to them by letter, and they have given valuable assistance and advice to emigrants when first settling in a new country.

(f) The publication of some thousands of handbooks for the use of emigrants has in the past proved a valuable help to them. These books contain particulars about the various Colonies, and other matters likely to be of assistance. The recent establishment by the English Government of an "Emigrants Information Office," where books, leaflets, and information may be had, is found to be of very great service.

(g) A large number of books (Bibles, Prayer-books, and other books of a religious or interesting nature) have been provided for the emigrants on their outward voyage. Many of these have been given away, and in this manner religious teaching and influence have been brought to bear upon them.

(h) Forms of Letters of Commendation for the use of emigrants have been issued in large numbers,* and it is most desirable that Clergymen should provide themselves with these letters. The Clergyman of the parish in which the intending emigrant resides should fill up such forms, and address to a Bishop or Clergyman of the Church abroad, where the emigrant intends to settle. Where these letters have been given, they have been proved to be of real value, as forming a link

* For a copy of this Form, see Schedule A.

between home and foreign countries, and securing for the emigrant a welcome from the Church.

III. Work still remaining to be done.

Your Committee consider that, notwithstanding the praiseworthy efforts made and carried out, for the moral and spiritual welfare of emigrants, a very large and increasing amount of work lies before the Church, which calls for immediate, earnest, and united action on the part of every branch of the Anglican Communion. They consider that this work may be attempted in two ways : (i.) as a development and improvement of existing organisations ; and (ii.) as a new departure.

(A) Under the head of *the development of organisations* which already exist, your Committee would mention the following suggestions which seem to be of importance :—

(1) That the English Bishops should impress upon the Parochial Clergy, at Diocesan Conferences and on other occasions, the solemn duty (*a*) of providing that not one of their Parishioners be allowed to leave home without being provided with a Letter of Commendation to the Church abroad, stating particularly whether they have been baptised and confirmed, or are communicants ; (*b*) of informing intending emigrants that the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America is the only Church in the United States which is in full communion with the Church of England.

(2) That it is expedient that letters should be sent from England (in addition to the above Commendatory Letters), to precede the emigrant on his journey out. These letters should be sent to the Bishop abroad, and should give notice of the intended arrival of the emigrant, adding such information with regard to character and qualifications as may be of assistance to

the Bishop or Clergyman to whom the emigrant is commended.

(3) That the Bishops in the Colonies and in the United States of America be urged to press upon their Clergy the duty of prompt attention to such Commendatory Letters as may be presented to them from emigrants, either directly or through the Bishops.

(4) That the attention of the Church in the United States be called to the extreme desirability and need of at once increasing the number of immigrant Chaplains at New York and other ports, where at present the number of emigrants makes it impossible for the existing staff to minister adequately to those who arrive. At New York especially it would seem that these increased Church ministrations should be supplied with as little delay as possible.

(5) That, with the view of increasing the number of Chaplains who shall accompany emigrants on the voyage, the Clergy should be specially invited, when travelling to the Colonies, to take every opportunity of acting as Chaplains on board emigrant ships.*

(6) That, in consideration of the great influence exercised upon emigrants by the Government Matron on board-ship, it is important that care be taken in the selection of good Christian women for the office.

(B) Your Committee feel that the work which has already been attempted for the spiritual welfare of our emigrants has been carried out by the best methods, and therefore their recommendations for the future have been mainly devoted to the development and extension of existing organisations.

* Full information as to the duties of such Chaplains, and of the remuneration which can in some cases be offered them, is obtainable from the S.P.C.K.

They would, however, suggest for consideration the following four *points of new departure*, as being, in their opinion, of paramount importance at the present time:—

(1) That the Church in Australasia and in Canada be urged to provide more adequate spiritual ministrations for immigrants at the ports of arrival, by the appointment of Chaplains whose whole time could, if necessary, be devoted to the work.

(2) That it is most desirable to establish homes for emigrants at the ports of departure and arrival, where those needing protection or care may be received.

(3) That the Archbishops of Canterbury and York and the Bishop of London be requested to prepare a Form of Prayer for Use at Sea, having regard to the special needs of emigrants.

(4) That it would be of great service if more frequent and regular interchange of reports of work done, and of the requirements in respect of emigrants, could take place between the Church in England and the Church in the United States and in the Colonies.

Your Committee cannot bring their report to a close without expressing their deep thankfulness to Almighty God for the measure of success which has hitherto attended the Church in her efforts on behalf of her emigrants, and an earnest prayer for the guidance and blessing of the Holy Spirit in the years to come.

Signed on behalf of the Committee,

R. LLANDAFF,
Chairman.

SCHEDULE A.

[FORM OF COMMENDATORY LETTER.]

.....

Reverend and dear Sir,

*I desire herewith to commend to your pastoral care
and brotherly good offices.....
from the Parish of..... in the
Diocese of..... who is about to
settle in.....*

*And I certify that**.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

Dated this.....

** Here state whether baptised, confirmed, or a Communicant.*

[S.P.C.K.]

No. 8.—MUTUAL RELATIONS.

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE* APPOINTED TO CONSIDER
THE SUBJECT OF THE MUTUAL RELATIONS OF
THE DIOCESES AND BRANCHES OF THE ANGLICAN
COMMUNION.

The Committee feel that it would be impossible for them to deal in any complete and exhaustive manner with a subject so extensive as that which has been referred to them for consideration. They have therefore determined to confine their attention to such definite and practical points as have been brought under their notice, and as appear to them to be worthy of being made the subject of report.

I.—The attention of the Committee has been directed to alleged neglect of certain important principles which were laid down by the Lambeth Conference of 1878. The principles are contained in the following quotations:—

- (1) First, that the duly-certified action of every national or particular Church, and of each ecclesiastical Province (or Diocese not in-

* Names of the Members of the Committee:—

Bishop of Carlisle (<i>Chairman</i>).	Bishop of Derry.
„ Adelaide.	„ Jamaica.
„ Auckland.	„ Manchester.
„ Brechin.	„ Moray and Ross.
„ Calcutta.	„ New Jersey.
„ Capetown.	„ North China.
„ Central Pennsylvania.	„ Sierra Leone.
„ Chester.	„ Tennessee.
„ Colombo.	

cluded in a Province), in the exercise of its own discipline, should be respected by all the other Churches, and by their individual members.

- (2) Secondly, that when a Diocese, or territorial sphere of administration, has been constituted by the authority of any Church or Province of this Communion within its own limits, no Bishop or other Clergyman of any other Church should exercise his functions within that Diocese, without the consent of the Bishop thereof.
- (3) Thirdly, that no Bishop should authorise to officiate in his Diocese a Clergyman coming from another Church or Province unless such Clergyman present letters testimonial, countersigned by the Bishop of the Diocese from which he comes, such letters to be as nearly as possible in the form adopted by such Church or Province in the case of the transfer of a Clergyman from one Diocese to another.

—*History of Lambeth Conferences*, pp. 120, 121.

The Committee would urge that more attention should be paid by Metropolitans and Bishops, or persons temporarily administering the affairs of a Diocese, to the practical enforcement of the principles above enunciated; and they would add in particular the following recommendation—namely, that the Archbishop of Canterbury be respectfully requested to consider whether it be possible to devise and suggest any means whereby it may be made more easy to avoid the intrusion of unworthy or pretended Priests or Deacons into the various Dioceses of the Anglican Communion.

II. It has been brought under the notice of the Committee that difficulty has arisen with regard to the validity of orders derived from certain Bishops alleged to be schismatical. It would be exceedingly desirable that some definite and uniform course of action should be adopted by all Bishops of the Anglican Communion in dealing with persons holding such so-called orders.

The Committee are of opinion that, although much may have been said to the contrary, there are in reality no persons claiming Anglican Orders of doubtful character whose claims deserve serious consideration. With regard to Orders alleged to be derived, though irregularly, through the American Church, it may be sufficient to say that the whole transaction is disallowed and regarded as null and void by the American Episcopate. This fact, in the opinion of the Committee, may be taken as a sufficient guide to all Bishops of the Anglican Communion.

III. A question has been brought before the Committee, based upon a Report made to the General Synod of the Dioceses in Australia and Tasmania, on the subject of the title of Archbishop. The Committee have been asked to express an opinion as to the desirability of assigning the title of Archbishop to the Primate of Australia and Tasmania. The Committee feel that there is great difficulty in coming to a clear judgment upon a question which must, of necessity, to some extent depend for its answer upon local circumstances; but taking the question upon broad grounds, and looking to the general interests of the whole Church, the Committee have no hesitation in expressing their opinion that there are cases of important Provinces in which distinct advantages would result from adopting the

ancient and honoured title of Archbishop. In the event of this course being adopted weighty questions might arise with regard to authority and precedence, but upon these questions the Committee think that it would be unwise to enter.

IV. The Committee have given anxious consideration to the question of the formation of a central Council of Reference, to which recourse may be had for advice on questions of doctrine and discipline by the tribunals of appeal of the various Provinces of the Anglican Communion.

With reference to this question, which has already been before the Conferences of 1867 and 1878, the Committee think that they cannot do better than call attention to what has actually been done in the case of Australia and Tasmania.

The following resolutions were adopted by the General Synod of Australia and Tasmania in 1872:—

If, in the opinion of the Committee of Appeal of the General Synod of the Church of England in Australia and Tasmania, the matter of appeal concerns a question of doctrine, or discipline involving a question of doctrine, the Committee may, at its discretion, state a case for the opinion thereon of a body in England, to be called the Council of Reference. Such Council of Reference shall consist of the Archbishops of Canterbury and York, and the Bishop of London, together with four laymen learned in the law, the first four such laymen being Lord Hatherley, Lord Chelmsford, Lord Cairns, and Lord Penzance. The General Synod shall have

power to fill up vacancies as they shall from time to time occur, but in the event of a vacancy or vacancies existing when a case shall be before the Council, the Archbishops and Bishop shall fill up the same for the purpose of disposing of that particular case. The opinion of the Council shall be binding on the Committee, and pending the obtaining of such an opinion, the appeal shall stand adjourned, with liberty to either of the parties to set the appeal down to be disposed of upon the opinion when obtained. If from any cause it shall be impracticable to obtain an opinion from the Council of Reference within a time to be limited by the rules to be made under the resolutions, the Committee of its own motion may, or at the instance of either of the parties shall, determine the appeal; but in such case the concurrence of one of the two Bishops shall be requisite in any decision.

The Committee are of opinion that a plan of reference to a Council in England, framed upon such principles as those adopted by the General Synod of Australia and Tasmania, would probably meet the wants, should they arise, of other Provinces.

It has been brought to the attention of the Committee, that in some parts of the Anglican Communion, notably, in the Province of the West Indies, schemes somewhat different from that above described have been adopted. It is needless to say that the Committee do not desire to pass an opinion upon details, but only to indicate a general method of action.

V. The attention of the Committee has been further directed to the danger of important divergencies with regard to matters of doctrine, as well as forms of worship, being introduced amongst the Anglican Churches by the possible assumption on the part of each Province or Diocese of the power of revising the Book of Common Prayer. Such divergencies might be injurious to the Church at large, and would certainly interfere with the mutual relations of its different parts.

It is not within the province of the Committee to lay down rules as to the powers of the different branches of the Anglican Communion in this matter, or as to the line of action which they ought to follow. This remark applies with especial emphasis to the Episcopal Church of America, though the Committee cannot abstain from remarking with pleasure that recent changes made in the Book of Common Prayer by that Church have been rather in the direction of nearer approach to the English Book than of further departure from it. But with regard to the branches of the Church within the limits of Her Majesty's dominions, the Committee cannot express too strongly the opinion which they entertain with regard to the danger of alteration in existing services. They do not deny in general that the Book of Common Prayer may be susceptible of improvement; this susceptibility may probably be predicated of all things human; though it must be remembered that it might be hard to find many improvements, which would be generally and heartily accepted as such. Neither do they wish to express an opinion unfavourable to efforts made to supplement the prayers and services of the Church by others which her needs demand. But the point which the Committee would chiefly urge is this—that the Book

of Common Prayer is not the possession of one Diocese or Province, but of all; that a revision in one portion of the Anglican Communion must, therefore, be extensively felt, and that it is not just that any particular portion should undertake revision without consultation with other portions, and especially with the Church at home.

VI. There appears to be a notion current that Clergymen ordained for work in England, who go out to labour for a time in the Colonies, are regarded as more or less disqualified for subsequent preferment at home. The Committee regret that such a notion should be current, and they are of opinion that Clergymen who have been willing to give a portion of the best time of their lives to colonial work may be regarded as having special claims for consideration on their return home. The Committee are aware that the subject is not free from difficulties, and that it is impossible to lay down any general rule; but they have thought it right to give it a place in their Report, and that some benefit may arise from the course thus adopted.

These are all the matters which have been brought under the notice of the Committee, or which have been deemed of sufficient importance or of a suitable kind to be brought before the Conference. In concluding their Report the Committee would desire to express their sense of the extent and difficulty of the subject which has been entrusted to them, and of the modest character of their contribution to its treatment. But they believe that the wise and perhaps the only course of dealing with such a subject is not to attempt to lay down rules which shall solve all possible problems, but to discuss practical difficulties as they arise, in de-

pendence upon the Holy Spirit of God, and trusting that He who permits the difficulties will give grace and strength to overcome them.

Signed on behalf of the Committee,

H. CARLISLE,

Chairman.

APPENDIX TO REPORT OF COMMITTEE

No. 8.

Another subject has been brought under the notice of the Committee, concerning which they have felt great doubt as to whether it can be regarded as coming within the terms of their reference. The subject, however, is so important, and the Committee have felt so desirous that it should be fairly brought before the Conference, that they have determined to introduce it in the form of an Appendix to their Report.

The question was raised in the first meeting of the Conference, whether it would not be desirable that some declaration should be made concerning the teaching of the English Church, and of those Churches which are in full communion with her.

There can be little doubt as to the existence of much ignorance and misunderstanding, not only as to what this teaching is, but also as to the ground upon which those Churches stand, and as to their relation to other Churches and Christian Societies. Such ignorance and misunderstanding can scarcely fail to interfere seriously with the results of their teaching.

It is true that the English Church possesses a body of teaching in the Book of Common Prayer, in the Catechism, and in the Thirty-nine Articles, to say nothing of the Book of Homilies. But these repositories of teaching, precious as they are, do not appear to the Committee to possess the qualities which ought to belong to a declaration, such as is contemplated in the remarks

now made. What is wanted is a plain and brief summary of the definite doctrinal grounds upon which the Anglican Churches stand (somewhat, perhaps, after the manner of the earlier of the Thirty-nine Articles), together with a statement of their relation to other Churches and Christian Societies, and, perhaps, of other cognate matters upon which, on consideration of the whole subject, it might be considered desirable that some distinct utterance should be made. The summary should be such as the whole body of English-speaking Bishops could adopt ; it should, therefore, be free from all questions of doubtful controversy ; it should be a document which could be freely circulated as a manifesto of the Anglican Churches concerning their status and their teaching.

The proposal, undoubtedly, has its difficulties, as almost every important proposal has ; but we think that the difficulties might possibly be overcome ; and certainly all danger of mischief would be avoided, if the following plan were adopted :—

It is respectfully suggested :

(1) That a small Committee of English Bishops be appointed by the Archbishop of Canterbury for the purpose of drafting such a declaration.

(2) That the Committee have power to consult, if they think fit, with any of their episcopal brethren, and also with eminent divines outside the episcopal body.

(3) That the draft declaration, having been provisionally settled by the Committee, be submitted to the Archbishop of Canterbury, with the request that his Grace will forward copies to each Metropolitan for the consideration of the Bishops in his Province, and that he will, in conjunction with the Archbishop of York, bring the declaration before the English Bishops.

[The term Metropolitan includes Primates of Provinces, the Primus of Scotland, and the Presiding Bishop of the Church of America.]

(4) That each Metropolitan be requested to return a copy of the declaration, either approved, or with suggestions of amendment, within twelve months.

(5) That the Archbishop of Canterbury be requested upon the return of the drafts to take such further steps as the circumstances in his judgment shall appear to warrant.

The Committee recommend that the declaration should be in the form of a series of statements or articles ; each dealing with a different subject, and to be expressed in the simplest possible language.

The Committee feel that they would be going beyond their province if they attempted to dictate the subjects upon which statements should be framed : but in order more clearly to indicate the kind of declaration which they think the needs of the time demand, they venture to specify the following subjects which they believe might be profitably introduced :—

- I. Of the Catholic Faith.
- II. Of the Holy Scriptures.
- III. Of the Sacraments.
- IV. Of the Forms of Prayer and Liturgy in use in the Anglican Churches.
- V. Of the relation of the Anglican Churches to the Church of Rome.
- VI. Of the relation of the Anglican Churches to the Churches of the East.
- VII. Of the relation of the Anglican Churches to other Christian Churches and Societies.

VIII. Of the relation of the teaching of the Church
of Christ to human knowledge.

It is almost unnecessary to state that the Committee do not regard the above list as exhaustive ; nor, on the other hand, do they desire to insist upon each and all of the suggested subjects as essential to the completeness of the proposed declaration.

Signed on behalf of the Committee,

H. CARLISLE,

Chairman.

No. 9.—HOME REUNION.

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE* APPOINTED TO CONSIDER WHAT STEPS (IF ANY) CAN BE RIGHTLY TAKEN ON BEHALF OF THE ANGLICAN COMMUNION TOWARDS THE REUNION OF THE VARIOUS BODIES INTO WHICH THE CHRISTIANITY OF THE ENGLISH-SPEAKING RACES IS DIVIDED.

The Committee was appointed to consider "what steps (if any) can be rightly taken, on behalf of the Anglican Communion, towards the Reunion of the various bodies into which the Christianity of the English-speaking races is divided."

I. On entering upon their duty they had at once brought to their notice evidence of a strong *consensus* of authoritative opinion, from various branches of the Anglican Communion, that the time for some action in this matter, under prayer for God's guidance through many acknowledged difficulties and dangers, has already come; and that the Conference—speaking, as it must speak, with the greatest weight of moral authority—should not separate without some such utterance as may further and direct such action.

In the Convocation of Canterbury the subject has

* Names of the Members of the Committee :—

Bishop of Sydney (<i>Chairman</i>).	Bishop of Minnesota.
" Adelaide.	" Nelson.
" Antigua (Coadjutor).	" New York.
" Brechin.	" Ripon.
" Edinburgh.	" Rochester.
" Hereford.	" Rupertsland.
" Jamaica.	" St. Andrew's.
" Lichfield.	" Wakefield.
" Manchester.	

been under discussion, at intervals, for nearly thirty years. In the year 1861 a resolution, on the motion of the Rev. Chancellor Massingberd, was carried *nem. con.* in the Lower House, praying the Bishops to commend the subject of "the Reunion of the divided members of Christ's Body" to the prayers of the faithful.

In 1870, at the instance of the Lower House, a Committee was appointed on Reunion, with power to confer with any similar Committee which might be appointed in the Northern Province. The Committee, in its Report, recommended the use of the special Prayer for Unity, appointed for the day of the Queen's Accession, and the consideration of the propriety of communication on the subject with the chief Nonconformist bodies; and these recommendations, after a singularly interesting debate, were adopted by the House.

The Report contained the following passage:—"The Committee do not recommend that we should set out with proposing alterations of our existing formularies of faith and worship, while they by no means deny that concessions might be admitted hereafter, as the consequence of negotiations carried on in a spirit of love and unity." It also suggested that on the day of the Queen's Accession "all classes of Nonconformists should be invited to institute similar prayers" for unity, and that the subject might be brought by Sermons before our own people.

In 1887 the subject was again taken up, and a Resolution carried, on the motion of Canon Medd, that "His Grace the President be requested to direct the appointment of a Joint Committee to consider, and from time to time to report upon, the relations between the Church and those who in this country are alienated from her Communion; and generally to make sugges-

“ tions as to means which might tend, by God's blessing,
“ to the furtherance of union of all among our country-
“ men who hold the essentials of the Christian faith.”
In the speech of the mover of the resolution special
reference was made to the probability of the discussion
of the subject at the Lambeth Conference.

In the Convocation of York, the Committee have
reason to know that similar action has been taken ; but,
under pressure of time, they have been unable to obtain
detailed information of the actual proceedings.

From various Synods of the Colonial Church similar,
and even stronger, expressions of a desire to make some
movement on the part of the Anglican Communion in
this direction have been brought before the Committee.
The General Synod of the Church in Australia and
Tasmania, in 1886, “ desired to place on record its solemn
“ sense of the evils of the unhappy divisions among
“ professing Christians, and, through His Grace the
“ Archbishop of Canterbury, respectfully prayed the
“ Conference of Bishops to be assembled at Lambeth
“ in 1888 to consider in what manner steps should be
“ taken to promote greater visible unity among those
“ who hold the same Creed.” A Resolution was passed
in almost the same words by the Diocesan Synod of
Montreal ; and similar Resolutions by the Provincial
Synod of Rupertsland, and the General Synod of New
Zealand. At the Session of the Provincial Synod of
Canada in 1886, a Joint Committee was appointed, to
confer with any similar Committees, which might be
appointed by other Religious Bodies, on the terms upon
which some honourable union might be arrived at.

But the most important and practical step has been
taken by our brethren of the American Church in the
General Convention of 1886, in accordance with the

prayer of a petition signed by more than a thousand Clergy, including thirty-two Bishops. At that Convention a Committee of the House of Bishops presented a remarkable Report, which, after stating emphatically that the Church did "not seek to absorb other Communions, " but to co-operate with them on the basis of a common " Faith and Order, to discountenance schism, and to heal " the wounds of the Body of Christ " ; and that she was prepared to make all reasonable concessions on " all " things of human ordering and of human choice," dwelt upon the duty of the Church to preserve, " as " inherent parts of the sacred deposit of Christian faith " and order committed by Christ and His Apostles to " the Church, and as therefore essential to the restoration " of unity," the following:—

" 1. The Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testament, as the Revealed Word of God.

" 2. The Nicene Creed, as the sufficient statement of the Christian Faith.

" 3. The two Sacraments—Baptism and the Supper of the Lord—ministered with unfailing use of Christ's words of institution, and the elements ordained by Him.

" 4. The Historic Episcopate, locally adapted in the methods of its administration to the varying needs of the nations and peoples called of God into the Unity of His Church."

The Report concluded with the following words:—

" Furthermore, deeply grieved by the sad divisions which afflict the Christian Church in our own land, we hereby declare our desire and readiness, so soon as there shall be any authorised response to this Declaration, to enter into brotherly conference with all or any Christian bodies seeking the restoration of organic Unity of the Church, with a view to the earnest study of the conditions,

under which so priceless a blessing might happily be brought to pass."

This Report was adopted by the House of Bishops, and communicated to the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies; and, at the instance of the latter House, it was resolved—

"That a Commission consisting of five Bishops, five Clerical and five Lay Deputies, be appointed, who shall at their discretion communicate, to the organised Christian Bodies of our country, the Declaration set forth by the Bishops on the twentieth day of October; and shall hold themselves ready to enter into brotherly conference with all or any Christian Bodies seeking the restoration of the organic unity of the Church."

After consideration of these significant documents, and of memorials from certain Associations which have already done good service in this cause, it was decided by the Committee that they were more than justified in recommending to the Conference that some steps should be taken by it in the direction specified in the Resolution constituting the Committee.

II. In considering how this could best be done, it appeared to the Committee that the subject divided itself naturally into two parts; first, the basis on which the united Church might, in the future, safely rest; secondly, the conditions under which present negotiations for reunion, in view of existing circumstances, could be carried on.

The Committee with deep regret felt that, under present conditions, it was useless to consider the question of Reunion with our brethren of the Roman Church, being painfully aware that any proposal for reunion would be entertained by the authorities of that Church only on condition of a complete submission on

our part to those claims of absolute authority, and the acceptance of those other errors, both in doctrine and in discipline, against which, in faithfulness to God's Holy Word, and to the true principles of His Church, we have been for three centuries bound to protest.

But, in regard to the first portion of the subject, the Committee were of opinion that with the chief of the Non-conforming Communions there would not only be less difficulty than is commonly supposed as to the basis of a common faith in the essentials of Christian doctrine, but that, even in respect of Church Government, many of the causes which had originally led to secession had been removed, and that both from deeper study and from larger historical experience, there was in the present day a greater disposition to value and to accept the ancient Church Order. It did not, indeed, appear to them that the question before them, which was of the duty, if any, of the Anglican Communion in this matter, was to be absolutely determined by these considerations; but they seemed, nevertheless, to give important encouragement to the Church in the endeavour to do what might appear to be her duty in furthering this all-important matter.

Accordingly, after careful consideration, they determined to take as the basis of their deliberations on this part of the subject the chief articles embodied in the Report of the Committee of the House of Bishops in the American Church; and after discussion of each, they submit them to the wisdom of the Conference, with some modifications, as supplying the basis on which approach might be, under God's blessing, made towards Reunion:—

1. The Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, as "containing all things necessary to

salvation," and as being the rule and ultimate standard of faith.

2. The Apostles' Creed, as the Baptismal Symbol ; and the Nicene Creed, as the sufficient statement of the Christian faith.

3. The two Sacraments ordained by Christ Himself—Baptism and the Supper of the Lord—ministered with unfailing use of Christ's words of institution, and of the elements ordained by Him.

4. The Historic Episcopate, locally adapted in the methods of its administration to the varying needs of the nations and peoples called of God into the Unity of His Church.

The Committee believe that upon some such basis as this, with large freedom of variation on secondary points of doctrine, worship, and discipline, and without interference with existing conditions of property and endowment, it might be possible, under God's gracious providence, for a reunited Church, including at least the chief of the Christian Communion of our people, to rest.

III. But they are aware that the main difficulty of the subject lies in the consideration of what practical steps can be taken towards such reunion under the actual religious conditions of the community at home and abroad—complicated, moreover, in England and Scotland by legal difficulties. It appears to them, moreover, clear that on this subject the Conference can only express an opinion on general principles, and that definite action must be left to the constituted authorities in each branch of our Communion, acting, as far as possible, in concert.

They therefore respectfully submit to the Conference the following Resolution :—

“ That the constituted authorities of the various
 “ branches of our Communion, acting, so far
 “ as may be, in concert with one another,
 “ be earnestly requested to make it known
 “ that they hold themselves in readiness
 “ to enter into brotherly conference (such
 “ as that which has already been proposed
 “ by the Church in the United States of
 “ America) with the representatives of other
 “ chief Christian Communions in the
 “ English-speaking races, in order to con-
 “ sider what steps can be taken, either
 “ towards corporate reunion, or towards such
 “ relations as may prepare the way for fuller
 “ organic unity hereafter.”

IV. They cannot conclude their report without laying before the Conference the following suggestion, unanimously adopted by the Committee:—

“ That the Conference recommend as of great
 “ importance, in tending to bring about Re-
 “ union, the dissemination of information
 “ respecting the standards of doctrine and
 “ the formularies in use in the Anglican
 “ Church ; and that information be dis-
 “ seminated, on the other hand, respecting
 “ the authoritative standards of doctrine,
 “ worship, and government adopted by the
 “ other bodies of Christians into which the
 “ English-speaking races are divided.”

They also desire—following in this respect the example of the Convocation of Canterbury—to pray the Conference to commend this matter of Reunion to the special prayers of all Christian people, both within

and (so far as it may rightly do so) without our Communion, in preparation for the Conferences which have been suggested, and while such Conferences are going on; and they trust that the present Lambeth Conference may also see fit to issue, or to pray His Grace the President to issue, some pastoral letter to all Christian people, upon this all-important subject. For never certainly did the Church of Christ need more urgently the spirit of wisdom and of love, which He alone can bestow, who is "the Author and Giver of all good things."

Signed on behalf of the Committee,

ALFRED SYDNEY,

Chairman.

SCANDINAVIANS—OLD CATHOLICS

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE* APPOINTED TO CONSIDER THE RELATION OF THE ANGLICAN COMMUNION (A) TO THE SCANDINAVIAN AND OTHER REFORMED CHURCHES, (B) TO THE OLD CATHOLICS AND OTHER REFORMING BODIES.

A.

Your Committee consider that, in view of the increasing number of Swedes and other Scandinavians now living in America and in the English Colonies, as well as for the furtherance of Christian Unity, earnest efforts should be made to establish more friendly relations between the Scandinavian and Anglican Churches.

In regard to the Swedish Church your Committee are of opinion that, as its standards of doctrine are to a great extent in accord with our own, and its continuity as a national Church has never been broken, any approaches on its part should be most gladly welcomed with a view to mutual explanation of differences, and the ultimate establishment, if possible, of permanent

* Names of the Members of the Committee :—

Bishop of Winchester	Bishop of Dunedin.
(<i>Chairman</i>).	„ Gibraltar.
Archbishop of Dublin.	„ Iowa.
Bishop of Albany.	„ Lichfield.
„ Cashel.	„ Lincoln.
„ Central Africa.	„ North Carolina.
„ Cork.	„ Salisbury.
„ Derry.	„ Western New York.

intercommunion on sound principles of Ecclesiastical polity.

Greater difficulties are presented as regards communion with the Norwegian and Danish Churches by the constitution of their ministry ; but there are grounds of hope, in the growing appreciation of Church order, that in the course of time these difficulties may be surmounted. It is much to be desired that a basis of union should be formed with a people who are distinguished by great devotional earnestness and uprightness of character.

B.

By the name Old Catholics we understand, in general terms, those members of foreign Churches who have been excommunicated on account of their refusal, for conscience' sake, to accept the novel doctrines promulgated by the authority of the Church of Rome, and who yet desire to maintain in its integrity the Catholic Faith, and to remain in full communion with the Catholic Church. As in the previous Conference, held in 1878,* we declare that "all sympathy is due from the Anglican Church to the Churches and individuals protesting against these errors"; and "to those who are drawn to us in the endeavour to free themselves from the yoke of error and superstition we are ready to offer all help and such privileges as may be acceptable to them and are consistent with the maintenance of our own principles, as enunciated in our formularies."

Ten years have passed since this declaration was issued, and we are now called to consider more in detail

* Official Letter of 1878 in *Origin and History of the Lambeth Conferences*, pp. 135 and 136. S.P.C.K. 1888.

our relations to the different groups comprehended under this general title.

I.

First of all it is due to the ancient Church of Holland, which in practice accepts the title of Old Catholic, to recognise the fact that it has uttered energetic protests against the novel dogmas of the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin Mary, and of the universal Bishopric and infallibility of the Bishop of Rome. It is to this Church that the community, usually termed Old Catholic, in the German Empire, owes in the providence of God the Episcopal succession. We recognise, with thankfulness, the dignified and independent position which the Church of Holland maintained for many years in almost absolute isolation. It has now broken through this isolation, as regards its neighbours on the Continent. As regards ourselves, the Church of Holland is found on inquiry to be in agreement with our Church in many points, and we believe that with more frequent brotherly intercourse many of the barriers which at present separate us might be removed.

II.

The Old Catholic community in Germany differs from the Church of Holland, in this respect, amongst others, that it does not retain possession of the ancient Sees. The Bishop of that community has wisely refrained from assuming a territorial title; we are not, however, without hope that the Old Catholic body may be, with the divine guidance and in God's good time, instrumental in restoring to that country the blessing of a united national Church. It may be noted that Bishop Reinkens, shortly after his con-

secration, was recognised as a Catholic Bishop by the civil power in Prussia, Baden, and Hesse.* He and the parochial Clergy under him have the right and duty, recognised by the State, of teaching the children of their own confession in the public schools. They are also in undisturbed possession of a number of ancient churches and benefices, and receive for the present a subsidy granted by Parliament.

As regards the form of doctrine actually professed by this body, we believe that its return to the standards of the undivided Church is a distinct advance towards the reunion of Christendom. We learn that it formulates the fuller expression of its belief in catechisms and manuals of instruction, rather than in articles or confessions, because it desires to avoid any methods which might create or perpetuate divisions.

We cannot consider that it is in schism as regards the Roman Church, because to do so would be to concede the lawfulness of the imposition of new terms of communion, and of the extravagant assertions by the Papacy of ordinary and immediate jurisdiction in every Diocese. For ourselves we regard it as a duty to promote friendly relations with the Old Catholics of Germany, not only out of sympathy with them, but also in thankfulness to God, who has strengthened them to suffer for the truth under great discouragements, difficulties, and temptations. We owe them our intercessions, our support, and our brotherly counsel; and we have reason to believe that aid from individual

* The documents in question are printed at length in *Der Altkatholikismus*, published in 1887 by J. F. von Schulte, pp. 405, 415, 416. The Prussian Old Catholic law is to be found on pp. 44--46. Cp. pp. 549 foll. (Staatszuschuss für die Altkatholiken).

members of our Church may be most beneficially given towards the training of their future Clergy.

We see no reason why we should not admit their Clergy and faithful Laity to Holy Communion on the same conditions as our own Communicants, and we also acknowledge the readiness which they have shown to offer spiritual privileges to members of our own Church.

We regret that differences in our marriage laws, which we believe to be of great importance, compel us to state that we are obliged to debar from Holy Communion any person who may have contracted a marriage not sanctioned by the laws and canons of the Anglican Church. Nor could we, in justice to the Old Catholics, admit anyone who would be debarred from communion among themselves.

III.

The "Christian Catholic Church" in Switzerland, which has adopted a title long used by the Church in that country, has a recognised civil position of much the same character as that possessed by the Old Catholics of Germany. We consider that it is a body now sufficiently established to receive the assurance of the same sympathy and the offer of the same privileges from ourselves.

IV.

The Old Catholic community in Austria has been recognised by the State as a distinct religious association, in accordance with the law of May 20th, 1874.* Its constitution provides for the presidency of a Bishop, but no election has as yet taken place, not from any

* Von Schulte, *Der Altkatholikismus*, p. 435.

indifference on the part of its members, but on account of the difficulty of securing the stipend required by law. In the mean time it has many of the rights secured by law to the German body. The Austrian Old Catholics have made great sacrifices, and deserve great sympathy from us ; which we hope may be expressed in a practical manner. They have, we believe, an important future before them, if rightly guided. We cannot, however, regard the organisation in Austria as sufficiently tried and complete to warrant a more formal relation on our part at the present time.

V.

The same remark applies with even greater force to the smaller groups of brave and earnest men of the Latin races, driven under somewhat similar circumstances to associate themselves in separate congregations in Italy, France, Spain, and Portugal. We sympathise with their efforts to free themselves from the burden of unlawful terms of communion. We have reason to believe that there are many who think with them, but have not seen the way to follow the outward steps which they have taken. We trust that in time they may be enabled to adopt such sound forms of doctrine and discipline and to secure such Catholic organisation as will permit us to give them a fuller recognition. We desire, in our outlook into the future, to call to mind the well-known declaration of the Gallican Clergy of 1682,* and also the advances made by Archbishop Wake in correspondence with the Doctors of the Sorbonne,†

* See Bossuet's *Défense de la Déclaration du Clergé de France*, &c. 2 vols., 4to. Amsterdam 1745, and Dupin's *Manuel du Droit public ecclésiastique français*, pp. 97—100, ed. 5, Paris, Henri Plon, 1860.

† Archbishop Wake wrote as follows to Mr. Beauvoir, on November 18th, 1718, in regard to this correspondence :—" If we

towards establishing a basis for intercommunion between the Churches of France and England. If some such principles could now be revived, we have reason to believe that they would be welcomed by many both in France and Italy, and they might again form the basis for hopeful negotiations.

In concluding this portion of our Report we feel it our duty to express the opinion that the consecration, by Bishops of our Communion, of a Bishop, to exercise his functions in a foreign country, within the limits of an ancient territorial jurisdiction and over the natives of that country, is a step of the gravest importance and fraught with enduring consequences, the issues of which

“ could once divide the Gallican Church [from the Roman], a reformation in other matters would follow as a matter of course. The scheme that seems to me most likely to prevail, is, to agree in the independence (as to all matters of authority) of every national Church on any others ; and in their right to determine all matters that arise within themselves ; and, for points of doctrine, to agree, as far as possible, in all articles of any moment (as in effect we already do, or easily may) ; and, for other matters, to allow a difference till God shall bring us to a union in those also. One only thing should be provided for, to purge out of the public offices of the Church such things as hinder a perfect communion in the service of the Church, that so, wherever any come from us to them or from them to us, we may all join together in Prayers and the Holy Sacraments with each other. In our Liturgy there is nothing but what they allow, save the single rubric relating to the Eucharist ; in theirs nothing but what they agree may be laid aside, and yet the public offices be never the worse or more imperfect for the want of it. Such a scheme as this I take to be a more proper ground of peace at the beginning than to go to more particulars.”

The correspondence of Archbishop Wake with Mr. Beauvoir, Dr. Dupin, Dr. P. Piers Girardin, and others, is printed in the fourth Appendix to Dr. Maclaine's translation of Mosheim's *Church History*, vol. vi., pp. 126, foll., London, 1828. The above letter will be found in full on p. 172, and is quoted in Rev. G. G. Perry's *History of the English Church, third period*, p. 48, London, 1887.

cannot be foreseen. Whilst the right of Bishops of the Catholic Church to interpose under conditions of extreme necessity has always been acknowledged, we deprecate any action that does not carefully regard primitive and established principles of jurisdiction and the interests of the whole Anglican Communion.

VI.

Lastly, the Committee have been asked at the last moment to consider the subject of the orders of the United Brethren, commonly called the Moravians. At the last Conference a number of the Bishops "were recommended to associate with themselves such learned persons as they might deem eminently qualified to assist them by their knowledge of the historical difficulties involved."* These Bishops have not been able to act upon this recommendation, and no report is before the Conference. Your Committee, in the short time allowed them, have not found it possible to inquire into the details of this subject with such care as would enable them to propose to the Conference any sufficient basis for the expression of an authoritative opinion.

It must not, however, be overlooked that from time to time, up to the present day, very friendly relations have existed between Moravians and members of our Communion. In their greatest trials they have received from eminent English Bishops and Churchmen the sympathy and support due to a zealous body of Christians, imbued with a primitive spirit, and claiming to possess a valid Episcopate.

The labours of Moravian Missionaries are known to all the world. We should therefore welcome any

* *Origin and History of the Lambeth Conferences*, p. 137.

clearer illustration of their history and actual status on the part of their own divines.

The subjects committed to the consideration of this Committee have embraced, as will be seen, a very wide range of interests, and we have reluctantly been compelled, on this account, to confine our Report almost entirely to the bodies specified in the terms of our commission.

Signed on behalf of the Committee,

E. HAROLD WINTON,
Chairman.

No. 11.—EASTERN CHURCHES.

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE* APPOINTED TO CONSIDER
THE RELATION OF THE ANGLICAN COMMUNION TO
THE EASTERN CHURCHES.

Your Committee regard the friendly feelings manifested towards our Church by the Orthodox Eastern Communion as a matter for deep thankfulness. These feelings inspire the hope that at no distant time closer relations may be established between the two Churches. Your Committee, however, are of opinion that any hasty or ill-considered step in this direction would only retard the accomplishment of this hope. Our expectations of nearer fellowship are founded upon the friendly tone of the correspondence which the Archbishop of Canterbury and his predecessors have held from time to time with Patriarchs of the Orthodox Church, and upon the cordiality of the welcome given by the Heads of that Church to Anglican Bishops and Clergy, such as the Bishop of Gibraltar, who have travelled in the East. Additional grounds of hope are furnished by the visit of Archbishop† Lycurgus to England in 1870, by the conversation which passed between him and the present

* Names of the Members of the Committee :—

Bishop of Winchester.	Bishop of Limerick.
(<i>Chairman</i>).	” Meath.
Bishop Blyth.	” Springfield.
Bishop of Gibraltar.	” Travancore.
” Iowa.	

† Lycurgus, late Archbishop of Syra and Tenos.

Bishop of Winchester at Ely, by the words which Archbishop Lycurgus used at the conclusion of the second Conference held at Bonn* ; and by the request which the Orthodox Patriarch of Jerusalem recently addressed to the Archbishop of Canterbury, that the Anglican Bishopric in Jerusalem should be reconstituted, and that the head-quarters of the Bishop should be placed in that city rather than at Beyrout or elsewhere.

We reflect with thankfulness that there exist no bars, such as are presented to communion with the Latins by the formulated assertion of the infallibility of the Church residing in the person of the Supreme Pontiff, by the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception, and other novel dogmas imposed by the decrees of later Councils.

We must congratulate the Christian world that, through the research of a Greek Metropolitan, literature has been lately enriched by the recovery of an ancient document which throws unexpected light upon the early development of ecclesiastical organisation.

It would not be right, however, to disguise from our-

* At the end of the Conference at Ely (1870), Archbishop Lycurgus said,

“ When I return to Greece I will say that the Church of England is not like other Protestant bodies. I will say that it is a sound Catholic Church very like our own ; and I trust that by friendly discussion union between the two Churches may be brought about.”

At the end of the Bonn Conference (1875), he said to Dr. Von Döllinger,

“ In the name of all those of my own communion I thank you, Mr. President, for your marvellous efforts in the work of reuniting the several Churches, of bringing together again the so numerous divisions of the Rock of our Redeemer. Our joy is full ; and there will be great joy in our homes also. We earnestly pray God for His further blessing.”

selves the hindrances which exist on either side. The first and most formidable of these is the disputed clause inserted in the Creed of Constantinople, erroneously called the Nicene Creed, without any Conciliar authority, by the Latin Church. This clause, which has the prescription of centuries, and is capable of being explained in an orthodox sense, it may be very difficult to remove. Another barrier to full understanding between the Orthodox Eastern Church and ourselves would be the extreme importance attached by that Church to trine immersion in the rite of Baptism, which practice, however, there is nothing to prevent our Church from formally sanctioning. We, on the other hand, experience a somewhat similar difficulty as regards the Eastern rite of Confirmation, which we can hardly consider equivalent to ours, inasmuch as it omits the imposition of the Bishop's hands, and is usually conferred upon unconscious infants; yet we do not regard this as requiring members of the Orthodox Church to receive our Confirmation. It would be difficult for us to enter into more intimate relations with that Church so long as it retains the use of icons, the invocation of the Saints, and the cultus of the Blessed Virgin; although it is but fair to state that the Greeks, in sanctioning the use of pictorial representations for the purpose of promoting devotion, expressly disclaim the sin of idolatry, which they conceive would attach to the bowing down before sculptured or molten images. Moreover, the decrees of the second Council of Nicæa, sanctioning the use of icons, were framed in a spirit of reaction against the rationalising measures, as they were regarded, of the iconoclastic Emperors. The Greeks might be reminded that the decrees of that Council, having been deliberately rejected seven years afterwards by the Council of

Frankfort, and not having been accepted by the Latin Church till after the lapse of two centuries, and then only under Papal influence, cannot be regarded as binding upon the Church.

Your Committee would impress upon their fellow-Christians the propriety of abstaining from all efforts to induce individual members of the Orthodox Eastern Church to leave their own communion. If some be dissatisfied with its teaching or usages, and find a lack of spiritual life in its worship, they should be advised not to leave the Church of their baptism, but by remaining in it to endeavour to become centres of life and light to their own people; more especially as the Orthodox Eastern Church has never committed itself to any theory that would make it impossible to reconsider and revise its standards and practice.

Your Committee think it desirable that the Heads of that communion should be supplied with some authoritative document setting forth the historical facts relating to our orders and our position in the Catholic Church; as much misconception appears still to prevail on this subject. Your Committee feel that the position which England now occupies in Cyprus and in Egypt places in our hands exceptional opportunities of elevating the moral and spiritual life of our Eastern brethren. Especially may this be done by introducing or promoting higher education: any help given in this way we have reason to believe would be warmly welcomed. We rejoice to know that schools have lately been established at Constantinople and elsewhere for the purpose of supplying education to those who are in training for the ministry. In the more general diffusion of knowledge amongst the instructors of the people lies the best hope of that

mutual understanding and esteem for which the Heads of the Orthodox Church have shown so much desire.

Your Committee cannot be expected to deal separately with the other Churches of the East, among which the Armenian appears to be the largest and most important. Approaches have been made to us from time to time by Bishops and other representatives of this communion, appealing for aid in support of educational projects for the instruction of their own people. The Armenian Church lies under the imputation of heresy. But it has always protested against this imputation, affirming the charge to have arisen from a misconception of its formularies. The departure from orthodoxy may, perhaps, have been more apparent than real ; and the erroneous element in its creed appears now to be gradually losing its hold upon the moral and religious consciousness of the Armenian people.

In regard to other Eastern communities, such as the Coptic, Abyssinian, Syrian, and Chaldean, your Committee consider that our position in the East involves some obligations. And if these communities have fallen into error, and show a lack of moral and spiritual life, we must recollect that but for them the light of Christianity in these countries would have been utterly extinguished, and that they have suffered for many centuries from cruel oppression and persecution. If we should have opportunity, our aim should be to improve their mental, moral, and religious condition, and to induce them to return to the unity of the faith without prejudice to their liberty. This we take to be the purpose of the Assyrian Mission set on foot by the late Archbishop of Canterbury, and continued by his successor.

In conclusion, we would call attention to the fact that in the East advance is slow, and even in the West we find differences perpetuate themselves, owing to national peculiarities, hereditary prejudices, and other causes, in spite of real wish for unity. We think that Christians need to be cautioned against impatience in expecting quick results. Such impatience argues imperfect trust in the ultimate fulfilment of our Lord's prayer for His people that they "all may be ONE."

Signed on behalf of the Committee,

E. HAROLD WINTON,

Chairman.

No. 12.—AUTHORITATIVE STANDARDS.

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE* APPOINTED TO CONSIDER
THE SUBJECT OF AUTHORITATIVE STANDARDS OF
DOCTRINE AND WORSHIP.

In considering the subject of the Authoritative Standards of Doctrine and Worship, which are the primary means of securing internal union amongst ourselves, and of setting forth our Faith before the rest of Christendom, we acknowledge first of all with deep thankfulness to Almighty God the vital and growing unity of the great Communion to which we belong.

We acknowledge also with the same heartfelt thankfulness the increasing intercourse which is taking place between our own Churches and other Churches of Christendom, and the extension of our own Communion into many non-christian countries, to which God has especially called us to minister by the diffusion of the English-speaking race throughout the world.

The consideration of the new conditions thus created seems to call for a careful statement of our own position in regard to authoritative standards of doctrine and worship.

* Names of the Members of the Committee :—

Bishop of Ely (<i>Chairman</i>).	Bishop of Meath.
" Aberdeen.	" Nassau.
" Albany.	" Qu'Appelle.
" Arkansas.	" Rupertsland.
Bishop of Derry.	" Salisbury.
" Dover.	" St. David's.
" Edinburgh.	" Sydney.
" Grahamstown.	" Western New York.
Bishop in Japan.	

This statement is divided into three parts:—first, as to standards of doctrine and worship which unite us with the great Body of the Church Universal; second, as to those which regulate our internal union or should be imposed upon Missionary Churches; third, as to a manual of doctrine for general use, but which should not be authoritative.

I.

We recognise before all things, and amidst all discouragements and divisions, the great bond of an essential unity which exists amongst all Christians who own the one Lord Jesus Christ as their Head and King, who accept the paramount authority of Holy Scripture, who confess the doctrine of the Nicene Faith, and who acknowledge one Baptism into the Name of the Blessed Trinity.

But we cannot regard this measure of unity as adequately fulfilling our Lord's prayer that His followers should be one, and we feel, therefore, that it is our duty to explain our own principles as regards standards of doctrine and worship, in the humble hope of preparing the way, so far as in us lies, for the reunion of Christendom.

We have a duty to the Church Universal; we have a duty also towards those who are now distinctly within our own Communion or who may hereafter be so closely allied to it as to form practically one body with ourselves.

As in former Conferences,* we declare that we continue "united under one divine Head in the fellowship of the one Catholic and Apostolic Church, holding the one faith revealed in Holy Writ, defined in the Creeds,

* See "Origin and History of the Lambeth Conferences," pp. 62 and 119, S.P.C.K., 1888.

maintained by the primitive Church," and "affirmed by the undisputed" Œcumenical "Councils."

In defining our own position more explicitly we recognise, with the general consent of the Fathers, that the canonical books of the Old and New Testament "contain all things necessary to salvation," and are the rule and ultimate standard of all Christian doctrine.

In addition to the Creed commonly called the Nicene Creed, to which we have already referred, we, as a part of the Western Church, have a common inheritance in the "Apostles' Creed," confessed by us all in the Sacrament of Baptism. In like manner we accept the hymn *Quicumque vult*, whether or not recited in the public worship of our Churches, as resting upon certain warrant of Scripture, and as most useful, both at home and in our missions, in ascertaining and defining the fundamental mysteries of the Holy Trinity, and of the Incarnation of our Blessed Lord; and thus guarding believers from lapsing into heresy.

In relation to the doctrine of the Procession of the Holy Spirit, while we believe that there is no fundamental diversity of faith between the Churches of the East and West,* we recognise the historical fact that the clause *Filioque* makes no part of the Nicene Symbol as set forth by the authority of the undivided Church.

We are of opinion that, as opportunity arises, it would be well to revise the English version of the Nicene Creed and of the *Quicumque vult*.

* The Committee beg to refer, in illustration of this statement, to the important propositions, accepted by Members both of the Eastern and Western Churches, which were agreed to at the Re-Union Conference held at Bonn, August 16th, 1875, under the Presidency of Dr. J. J. I. von Döllinger. See the *Report of the Proceedings, &c.*, with a Preface by Dr. Liddon.—Pickering, London, 1876, pp. 103, 104.

We suggest to the Conference that the President be requested to appoint a Committee for this purpose.

With regard to the authority of the Œcumenical Councils our Communion has always recognised the decisions of the first four Councils on matters of faith, nor is there any point of dogma in which it disagrees with the teaching of the fifth and sixth.

The second Council of Nicæa commonly called the seventh Council is, however, not undisputed, and while we recognise the historical circumstances of the eighth century, which naturally led to the strong protest against iconoclasm made there, it is our duty to assert that our Church has never accepted the teaching of that Council in reference to the veneration of sacred pictures.

II.

From the standards of doctrine of the Universal Church which the whole Anglican Communion has always accepted,* we now pass to those standards of doctrine

* " Let Preachers take care that they never teach anything in a sermon which they wish to be religiously held and believed by the people, except what is in accord with the doctrine of the Old or New Testament and what the Catholic Fathers and ancient Bishops have collected from the same doctrine."—*Canon of 1571, concerning Preachers.*

" Such person &c. * * shall not in anywise have authority or power to order, determine or adjudge any matter or cause to be heresie, but onely such as heretofore have been determined, ordered or adjudged to be heresie, by the authority of the Canonical Scriptures or by the first four general Councils or any of them, or by any other general Council wherein the same was declared heresie by the express and plain words of the said Canonical Scriptures, or such as hereafter shall be ordered judged or determined to be heresie, by the High Court of Parliament of this realm, with the assent of the Clergy in their Convocation ; anything in this Act contained to the contrary notwithstanding."

and worship which are specially the heritage of the Church of England, and which are, to a greater or less extent, received by all her sister and daughter Churches. These are the Prayer Book with its Catechism, the Ordinal, and the XXXIX. Articles of Religion.

All these are subscribed by our clergy at ordination or admission to office, but the XXXIX. Articles are not imposed upon any person as a condition of communion. With respect to the Prayer Book and Articles, we do not consider it an indispensable condition of intercommunion that they should be everywhere accepted in their original form, or that the interpretation put upon them by local courts or provincial tribunals should be received by every branch or province of the Anglican Communion. In illustration of this principle, we would refer to the differences from the English Order of the Administration of the Holy Communion which have long existed in the Scottish and American Churches, and to the facts that the XXXIX. Articles of Religion were only accepted in America in the year 1801 with some variations, and in Scotland in 1804, and that the Church of Ireland as well as the Church in America, has introduced some modifications into the Book of Common Prayer.

We, however, strongly deprecate any further material variation in the text of the existing Sacramental offices of the Church, or of the Ordinal, than is at present recognised among us, unless with the advice of some Conference or Council representing the whole Communion.

With regard to the daily offices and such further forms of service as the exigencies of different Churches or countries may demand, we feel that they may be safely left for the present to the action of the Bishops of

each Province. We do not demand a rigid uniformity, but we desire to see the prevalence of a spirit of mutual and sympathetic concession, which will prevent the growth of substantial divergences between different portions of our communion. With regard to those Dioceses which are not yet united into Provinces, we recommend that the Bishop of the Diocese should not act in the way of revision of, or additions to, such offices without the advice of the Archbishop of Canterbury ; or in the case of foreign Missionary jurisdictions of the American Church, without the advice of its Presiding Bishop.

With regard to the XXXIX. Articles of Religion we thank God for the wisdom which guided our fathers, in difficult times, in framing statements of doctrine, for the most part accurate in their language and reserved and moderate in their definitions. Even when speaking most strongly and under the pressure of great provocation our Communion has generally refrained from anathemas upon opponents, and we desire in this to follow those who have preceded us in the faith. The omission of a few clauses in a few of the Articles would render the whole body free from any imputation of injustice or harshness toward those who differ from us. At the same time we feel that the Articles are not all of equal value, that they are not, and do not profess to be, a complete statement of Christian doctrine, and that, from the temporary and local circumstances under which they were composed, they do not always meet the requirements of Churches founded under wholly different conditions.

Some modification of these Articles may therefore naturally be expected on the part of newly-constituted Churches, and particularly in non-christian lands. But we consider that it should be a condition of the recognition of such Churches as in complete intercommunion with

our own, and especially of their receiving from us our episcopal succession, that we should first receive from them satisfactory evidence that they hold substantially the same type of doctrine with ourselves. More particularly we are of opinion that the Clergy of such Churches should accept articles in accordance with the positive statements of our own standards of doctrine and worship, particularly on the substance and rule of faith, on the state and redemption of man, on the office of the Church, and on the Sacraments and other special ordinances of our holy religion.

III.

In the foregoing resolutions we have confined ourselves to a consideration of existing authoritative formularies, and to such as may serve the like use under particular conditions. We are unable, after careful consideration of the subject, to recommend that any new declaration of doctrine should, at the present time, be put forth by authority. We are, however, of opinion that the time has come when an effort should be made to compose a manual for teachers which should contain a summary of the doctrine of the Church, as generally received among us. Such a manual would draw its statements of doctrine from authoritative documents already existing, but would exhibit them in a completer and more systematic form. It would also, naturally include some explanation of the Services and ceremonies of the Church. The whole might be preceded by a historical sketch of the position and claims of our Communion.

Such a Manual would, we believe, be of great service both in maintaining the type of doctrine to which we have referred, and in enabling members of other Churches to form a just opinion of our doctrines and

worship. We suggest that His Grace the President be requested to nominate three or more Bishops to undertake such a work, and, if it seem good to him and to the other Archbishops, Metropolitans, and presiding Bishops of the Church, that they give the work, when completed, the sanction of their imprimatur. We do not suggest that the Conference should be asked to undertake this work, or that it should be regarded as an authoritative standard of the Church.

Signed on behalf of the Committee,

ALWYNE, ELY,

Chairman.

